Universitat de València
Facultat de Filologia, Traducció i Comunicació
DEPARTAMENT DE FILOLOGIA ANGLESA I ALEMANYA

KIND KIT MARLOWE —OR MARLEY OR MERLIN

A Reading of Anthony Burgess's *A Dead Man in Deptford*
through the Naming Conventions Applied in the Novel

SUBMITTED BY:
PETER BLAIR

SUPERVISED BY:
DR. BARRY PENNOCK SPECK

VALENCIA, JANUARY 2010

Acknowledgements

In George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* one of the characters remarks that no book is produced individually, an observation which can be extended to doctoral theses, particularly this one. It is only fair, then, to acknowledge the help and encouragement I received while I was working on *Kind Kit Marlowe* and without which, as the saying goes, it would not have been possible. First of all I would like to thank my supervisor Dr Barry Pennock Speck, whose experience, insightful comments and plain common sense have helped make my thesis hang together. It goes without saying that whatever flaws that remain are entirely of my doing. Next, I would like to express a debt of gratitude to Dr Peter Vickers, a former member of the Department of English and German Philology and former supervisor. It was Peter who gave me the idea for my thesis and in a very real sense may be considered the only begetter thereof. I think thanks are also due to all my colleagues and staff of the Department for creating such a congenial atmosphere in which to work. Last but not least, I would like to thank my wife and son for their infinite patience and forbearance in putting up with the unholy trinity made up Christopher Marlowe, Anthony Burgess and myself for the many years it took me to write *Kind Kit Marlowe.*

Valencia, January 2010

Table of Contents

1. Statement of Aims

The main concern of the present thesis is to provide an account of the stylistic idiosyncrasies observed in the naming of the characters in Anthony Burgess's *A Dead*

Man in Deptford (Vintage, 1994), with special reference to the names applied to its protagonist, the dead man mentioned in the title. The description given of the novel under review in the blurb of the primary source, "a joyous celebration of the life of Christopher Marlowe," places the book among "the spate of fictions" (Downie 2000: 13) inspired by the Elizabethan poet and dramatist published on the quatercentenary of his death, 1993, the year in which Burgess's fictional memoir first came out. Like the protagonists of the companion novels —Robin Chapman, *Christoferus, or, Tom Kyd's Revenge* (London: Sinclair-Stevenson, 1993); Judith Cook, *The Slicing Edge of Death* (London: Simon and Schuster, 1993); Liam Macguire, *Icarus Flying: the Tragical Story of Christopher Marlowe* (Morden Park: Ormond, 1993) (Downie 2000: 194)[1]— Burgess's Marlowe is based on the lurid picture painted of the historical Christopher Marlowe by his less charitable contemporaries, apparently confirming the received image of the bogeyman that "got drunk, smoked, indulged in pederasty (...) and (...) blasphemed" (Burgess 1970: 86), finally coming to grief in a tavern brawl on Deptford Strand, a violent end broadly alluded to in the title. Central to Burgess's portrayal of Marlowe[2] is the combination of heterodoxy and homosexuality embodied in the playwright. Throughout much of the novel Marlowe is depicted as questioning both the tenets of the Christian faith and the motives of those who preach it, and maintaining love affairs with his patron Thomas Walsingham and the Narrator, an ageing theatre hack that claims to have known Marlowe both personally and professionally in his boyhood and early youth. Yet the portrayal reveals a Marlowe who is not quite the depraved reprobate one is familiar with today: the acute but unfocused angry young man of the beginning of the novel matures into an incisive if estranged commentator of his times. Through the Narrator, then, Burgess "presents a nonconformist Marlowe, but not a vicious Marlowe" (Tucker 1995: 114). To a large extent, indeed, the novel may be read as a denial of a malicious libel on Marlowe's

[1]To the works cited Hopkins (2004: 290-1) adds Stephanie Cowell, *Nicholas Cooke: Actor, Soldier, Physician, Priest* (London: Norton, 1993); Chris Hunt, *Mignon* (London: Gay Men's Press, 1987); Iain Sinclair, *Slow Chocolate Autopsy: Incidents from the Notorious Career of Norton, Prisoner of London* (London: Phoenix, 1998); Stephanie Merritt, *Gaveston* (London: Faber and Faber, 2000). The list can be augmented further with the inclusion of Robert DeMaria, *To Be A King* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1976); George Garrett, *Entered form the Sun* (New York: Doubleday, 1990); Louise Welsh, *Tamburlaine Must Die* (Edinburgh: Canongate Books, 2004).

[2] For the sake of clarity *Christopher Marlowe* will be used to refer to the biographical Christopher Marlowe, and *Marlowe* for the character based on the former.

good name put about by his enemies by presenting a Marlowe more sinned against than sinning.

Besides the more nuanced development of its main character, the feature that perhaps sets *A Dead Man in Deptford* apart from its companion novels is the highly contrived style it is written in, a feature which will be adopted as the starting point for this thesis. As Burgess says of his dystopian fantasy *A Clockwork Orange*, the elaborate style of *A Dead Man in Deptford* is meant "to put (…) language in the foreground" (1990: 244), a concern in part due to his grasp of formal linguistics[3]. The author of these novels, writes Byatt (2000: 1) in his introduction to *ABBA ABBA*, "was a trained linguist, and thought technically about sounds and rhymes in a way most novelists don't." Lodge (1996: 148-9) says of him that he "was a Renaissance man, polyglot and polymath" who "seemed to have read everything and forgotten nothing." Burgess had an encyclopaedic knowledge of English literature, and his novels were partly a pretext to exhibit this knowledge, the one to be examined being no exception to this. *A Dead Man in Deptford* is shot through with quotations from, allusions to, and echoes of numerous literary and non-literary works produced and consumed in late Tudor and early Jacobean England. Not content with an exhibition of his familiarity with early Modern English literature, he pastiches the prose style of the period, characterised as being "written always in language (…) highly contrived and often reeking of the lamp" (Burgess 1966: 6). The result is intricately patterned prose that makes abundant use of alliteration, parallelism, hyperbatons to name only a few of the figures of speech resorted to, hence Hopkins's description of *A Dead Man in Deptford* as a "stylishly post-modern" novel (2000: 143; 2004: 291). In many respects Burgess's recreation of Christopher Marlowe's life is a *tour de force* designed to elicit our admiration for the linguistic and literary acumen of its author.

The mock-euphuistic style it is written in makes the novel a self-referring text. The prominence accorded to its medium not only enhances awareness of the novel as a piece of creative writing, it also alerts the reader to the correspondences between the

[3] It should be noted that Burgess's notions of language theory, although well-grounded, would strike the present-day specialist as limited and outmoded. They seem to have been drawn principally from Saussure, the Prague School, Bloomfield and Chomsky, and he also had a sound understanding of historical linguistics. Although he was also conversant with post-structuralist and deconstruction theory, Burgess appears to have been somewhat dismissive of them. On the other hand, he does not appear to have followed the developments in pragmatics, even though this sub-discipline had long been consolidated by the composition of the novel under review. However, the virtues and shortcomings of Burgess's understanding of formal linguistics are not at issue as such, but how they are applied in the making of his novel.

text and language considered as a rule-governed relational system as conceived by formal linguistics. Burgess may have had these correspondences in mind when he wrote that the task of work of fiction "is to present or distort the real world through words," and that "we can only know reality through our minds, which function through structural oppositions, typically realized in phonemes and morphemes" (1990: 8). On the other hand his frequent recourse to tropes and wordplay seems to work against the cohesion and unity the ordering of its components strives for. Again, this is a trait seen as inherent in the language system. "Language," Burgess (1975 [1964]: 26) observes, "tends to be unsure of what it means, it tends to change form, meaning, and pronunciation." In mirroring language, *A Dead Man in Deptford* not only reveals the features which define it: structure, indeterminacy, and reflexivity. It also reveals language to be an unstable system in which structure and indeterminacy exist under tension.

The instability of the language system provides the background to the analysis of the naming practices in the novel, the principal focus of this thesis. The interest in naming is occasioned by the salience given to personal names, provisionally defined as proper names borne by human or anthropomorphised nominata. Their prominence is the result of two things. First, some names in the novel display a marked tendency to change form so that the same name appears under a variety of spellings, notably the protagonist's family name, *Marlowe*. Second, some names are frequently foregrounded by being brought into relation with other items on the strength of the formal similarities between them, inducing the reader to assign a meaning to them. This feature particularly affects the short form of Marlowe's forename, *Kit*, the form he is habitually called by throughout the novel. Names are consequently seen to partake of the incongruity of language outlined in the foregoing paragraph. The orthographical vagaries they undergo are a source of ambiguity which undermines and subverts the values assigned to them by virtue of the relations they enter into. Their conspicuousness strongly suggests that names are central to the inquiry into the internal contradiction of the language system. Also, as the names most affected by foregrounding are those which identify the main character, the ambiguity surrounding them reflects the problematic concerning the identity of their bearer and the circumstances of his violent and untimely death.

As regards its organisation, the main body of the thesis will fall into three broad parts, each centred on a well-known reference to a play by William Shakespeare:

"What's in a name?" (*Romeo and Juliet* II ii 43), "Fair is foul" (*Macbeth* I i 10), and "All the world's a stage" (*As You Like It* II vii 139). The reason for this is that the references provide a pithy introduction to the topics to be addressed, and that the examination of the issues they raise sets the directions the enquiry will take. Part One (Chapters 2-7) will deal with names considered as linguistic signs, focusing primarily on *Kit*, although *Tom* will come under review as well. The concern of Part Two (Chapters 8-12) will be with the name as a social deictic, and will examine the tension between positive and negative politeness in *Kit*, the avoidance of *Christopher* by Marlowe's acquaintances and the imposition of *Marlowe* over the other variants of the family name, as well as the significance acquired by the names of Marlowe's enemies. Part Three (Chapters 13-15) will be an examination of the use of literary names as framing devices, and the scope of the survey will be broadened to deal with identity, of which naming is a part. As the quote from *As You Like It* suggests, attention will move away from the names borne by the characters of Burgess's novel to those borne by the characters of Christopher Marlowe's stage plays, particularly *Faustus* and *Tamburlaine*. In the final chapter, moreover, the focus of the analysis will shift from Marlowe to the Narrator. Each of these three parts will be structured along the same lines. The first chapter will constitute a preamble centred on the linguistic issues raised by their respective Shakespearean quotes, together with the implications these issues have for the description of the naming practices in the novel. After establishing the purview of each part, there will be a discussion of the theoretical aspects of naming suggested by each Shakespearean reference. The purpose of this survey, however, is not to resolve the debate concerning the linguistic status of the proper name, as this undertaking would go beyond the scope of this dissertation but to ascertain the role of naming in the interpretation of *A Dead Man in Deptford*. Finally, there will be an examination of naming expressions in the light of the preceding theoretical characterisations followed by an interpretation of the findings. Despite the appearance of compartmentalisation suggested by this outline, there will be a good deal of overlap between the three parts insomuch as some aspects of naming will inevitably be pertinent in the analysis carried out in each, although from a different perspective.

Considering the subject matter of Burgess's novel, one will most probably be struck by the fact that its analysis is structured by quotes from plays by Christopher Marlowe's more illustrious coeval instead of his own works. References to works from the

Marlowe canon are certainly far from lacking, but none of them have any real bearing on names and naming. On the other hand the three Shakespearean quotes selected are not only relevant to this question, but also are alluded to in the narrative, along with a host of other references to Shakespeare's dramatic pieces. Indeed, the linguistic self-consciousness evinced in the convoluted prose style of *A Dead Man in Deptford* is a trait often identified with Shakespeare's dramatic art. What Elam (1984: 5) says of the dramatist's comedies,

> one of the salient characteristics of (...) [Shakespeare's] drama has been the foregrounding, or bringing to prominence, of the linguistic sign itself as phonetic, syntactic or semantic presence, a material factor to be bandied or toyed with or tortured or otherwise offered as immediate object of audience attention,

amplifies what Burgess says about *A Clockwork Orange*, and is therefore applicable to the novel to be reviewed here. The Shakespearean word-play in which Burgess indulges is internally justified by the Narrator's claim of having collaborated with the Bard in the writing of some of the latter's plays. If the purported author of *A Dead Man in Deptford* worked with Shakespeare, his prose style is likely to be influenced by his collaborator's weakness for wordplay.

To conclude this introductory chapter, it should be pointed out that the development of the thesis is conditioned by its subject matter. As stated above, its aim is to uncover a link between the naming of the most relevant characters of *A Dead Man in Deptford* and a particular reading of the novel. Since it is concerned with naming, the thesis advanced here will inevitably draw on onomastics for its theoretical base, the main source of exemplification being the names the characters are called by[4]. Yet the linguistic status of proper names, and by implication personal names, has long been an object of debate, not least because of the perception that they are not amenable to the methods of analysis developed by formal linguistics, a perception attested to by the observation on their marginal position within the language system contained in many studies on names (Ullman 1957 [1951]: 73; 1962: 77; Long 1969: 107; Lyons 1977:

[4] As the fiction hinges on the pretence that the book is a seventeenth-century manuscript, the naming of the characters should be seen to adhere to the conventions of the period the novel is set in for the make-believe to come off. Although possession of a family name is not fully generalised until the nineteenth century (Watt 1949: 324), attention to period detail does not involve added difficulty for the reader unacquainted with early Modern English onomastics because the names identifying the characters (which are not invented, as their bearers are all based on historical personages) largely conform to the Present-Day pattern of forename and family name. The most noticeable difference between early Modern and Present-Day naming practices is to be found in the more elaborate and finely-structured honorific system of the former because of the importance still accorded to gentility in the status hierarchy of the sixteenth and early seventeeth centuries.

222-3; Markey 1982: 129; Allerton 1987: 62; Crystal 1995: 139). This view is summed up by Burgess's contention that names only strictly come within the field of the lexicologist when they are no longer used for the unequivocal identification of their nominata (1975 [1964]: 103). The problematic nature of personal names will inevitably intrude on the examination of the questions raised by the Shakespearean quotes, and consequently one of the first tasks to be undertaken will be to provide a preliminary overview of personal names with a view to establishing a sufficiently consistent theoretical base that will allow the analysis of the naming practices in Burgess's novel to be carried out with a minimum of rigour. The review of the literature on the linguistic status of personal names will therefore be one of the concerns of the preamble to Part One and point of reference for the subsequent analyses of naming practices in *A Dead Man in Deptford*.

PART ONE

2. What’s in a Name?

As its main character is a major Elizabethan playwright, it is inevitable that *A Dead Man in Deptford* should contain references to Marlowe's career as a dramatist, among them the venue for most of his plays, the Rose theatre. The name of the playhouse is the key term in a staggered Shakespearean allusion, which, by virtue of its onomastic status, provides a useful point of entry into the survey of the stylistic significance of naming practices in Burgess's novel.

The Rose is mentioned for the first time in the novel by Philip Henslowe, the entrepreneur who produces Marlowe's plays:

> I have bought a share in the bear pit and, a hundred yards off, a very pretty rose garden. In that garden I am ready to build *what I shall call the Rose*, which is an apt name [p.17].

The second reference to the playhouse is made in the Narrator's relation of the première of the dramatist's first box-office success, *Tamburlaine, Part One*:

> *The Rose smelt of no roses*[5], rather still of size and paint and the armpits of the groundlings added [p.117].

If the italicised sections are put together and modified slightly, the resulting clause,

> [that which] I shall call the Rose [will, despite its name, smell] of no roses,

will be recognised as a parody of the well-known lines from Juliet's oft-quoted apostrophe to her lover

> that which we call a rose
> By any other name would smell as sweet
> (*Romeo and Juliet* II ii.43-4)[6].

The quotation retrieved from the passages cited is just one instance of the literary references that abound in the novel. However, Burgess's parody of the lines from Shakespeare's tragedy is more than a mere indulgence in wordplay, a legacy of his time with Shakespeare (see Chapter 2). The observation that a change of designation would have no practical effects on the rose has claimed the interest of the student of language as well as that of the literary critic. In parodying Juliet's statement, Burgess not only takes over the linguistic insights it contains but also brings new perspectives to bear on the questions it raises, making them a central concern for his novel.

[5] Italic script added in both excerpts.
[6] Unless stated otherwise, all references to Shakespeare's works are to the three-volume *Works of William Shakespeare* edited by W.J. Craig.

2.1. The Linguistic Issues Raised by "What's in a Name?"

The numerous comments elicited by the source of Burgess's parody have centred principally on the arbitrariness of linguistic expressions (Ullman 1957 [1951]: 73; 1962: 77; Zabeeh 1968: 3; Carroll 1985: 163; Lodge 1992: 36; Anderson 2004: 435). On the other hand Henslowe's offhand consideration of *the Rose* as an apt name for his prospective playhouse touches on another issue regarding names, indirectly related to the question of linguistic arbitrariness, which is that of their appropriateness. Linguistic arbitrariness and onomastic appropriateness, then, constitute the points of entry into the survey of names and naming to be undertaken in this chapter.

2.1.1. The Principle of Linguistic Arbitrariness

In descriptive linguistics *arbitrary* is broadly synonymous with *conventional*. Saussure (1971 [1916]: 100), the first to use the term in this sense, defines arbitrariness as the absence of intrinsic motivation for the association between the two constituent elements the linguistic expression is analysed into, namely the signifier, the phonological or graphological realisation of the expression, and the signified, the concept conveyed through the former. Returning to the lines from Juliet's complaint, something like 'thorny flower-bearing bush' is the signified of the noun *rose*, and /rəʊz/ and "rose" its signifier at the phonological and graphological levels respectively. There is nothing inherently rosy about these sequences of phonemes and graphemes: only a tacit agreement that they express the concept attached to them.

On reading the lines under review more carefully, one realises that they are as much as an extension of Saussure's definition of linguistic arbitrariness as an informal exposition of the principle. The complex subject of the clause, "that which we call a rose", is so structured as to reveal *rose* and the object it denotes to be separate entities. Instead of the noun that conventionally denotes it, the rose is referred to by the deictic expression *that* so as to create the impression of unmediated ostension. When the noun finally occurs, in the restrictive relative clause that post-modifies its substitute, it does so as the referent of *name*s. The implications of this instance of textual deixis (Lyons 1977b: 95) are worked out in the predicate of the clause. If *rose* is separate from the extra-linguistic entity it is applied to ―that is, its referent― the noun can also be detached from the latter and replaced with another one, without the change of designation affecting the entity involved. A rose is still a rose regardless of the term we are pleased to call it by. What is shown to be arbitrary here is the association of the

linguistic expression and its referent. There is no natural correspondence between *rose* and its referent: just an unspoken consensus among English speakers that this noun is the term to use when the referent rose is to be mentioned. The Shakespearean expression of linguistic arbitrariness does not conflict with the Saussurean definition of the principle, but rather follows logically from it (Crystal 1991 [1980]: 23; Bussmann 1996 [1990]: 32).

Shakespeare's insight into noun-referent relations is consonant with what is perhaps the first extant formulation of linguistic arbitrariness. In the *Cratylus*, Plato's dialogue on the relation of language with reality, Hermogenes states: "[n]o name belongs to a particular thing by nature, but only because of the rules and usage of those who establish the usage and call it by that name" (1999 [1998]: 2)[7]. The statement opposes the thesis advanced by his disputant Cratylus, which holds that there should be an existential link between a linguistic expression and its referent. Shakespeare's Juliet can be placed in the conventionalist tradition which goes from Plato's Hermogenes to Saussure's narrow definition of the arbitrariness principle.

2.1.2. Linguistic Arbitrariness and Proper Names

Owing to the focus on *rose*, the examination of linguistic arbitrariness has so far been confined to noun-referent relations. Zabeeh's interest in Juliet's lament (1968: 3-4) centres on nomination, the association of a name with its nominatum (Lyons 1977a: 217), more specifically on the relation of *Montague* and *Romeo* with their bearer. Accordingly, on viewing her speech in full,

> 'Tis but thy name that is my enemy;
> Thou art thyself, not a Montague.
> What's Montague? It is nor hand, nor foot,
> Nor arm, nor face, nor any other part
> Belonging to a man. O, be some other name!
> What's in a name? That which we call a rose
> By any other name would smell as sweet;
> So Romeo would, were he not Romeo call'd,
> Retain that dear perfection which he owes
> Without that title. Romeo, doff thy name;
> And for that name, which is no part of thee,
> Take all myself,

one sees the second occurrence of her lover's clan name is the referent of the noun phrases *thy name* and *some other name*, and that *that name* and *thy name* make

[7] All references to the *Cratylus* are to C.D.C. Reeve's translation.

reference to the second occurrence of his forename. As with the first instance, these examples of textual deixis draw attention to the separateness and separability of the names and their bearer, underscored by the clothing metaphor evoked by the verb *doff*.

Zabeeh's examination of Juliet's lament concludes by contending that the association of a name with its bearer is more arbitrary than that of a noun with its referent (1968: 4). The increased arbitrariness of the former relation is attributed to the unpredictability in the imposition of names to their respective bearers. While the referent of the noun *man* will, figurative uses excepted, invariably be an adult human male, no such assumption can be made of a personal name such as *Romeo*. Short of acquaintance with him, there is no way of knowing whether a given human male bears the name or not because any human male is a candidate for *Romeo*, along with *Anthony*, *John*, *Nicholas*, or any other institutionalised male name. In addition to this, no linguistic principle would be violated if *Romeo* was bestowed on female, or even non-human or inanimate entity (Lyons 1977: 221). Yet if *man* were to be applied in a non-figurative sense to a woman, a boy or a horse, then the noun would be regarded as a misnomer because such applications would be inconsistent with its lexical meaning, 'adult male human.'

The equation of the unpredictability of name-bearer relations, and by extension name-nominatum ones, with increased arbitrariness is of course debatable. Although not addressing Zabeeh's contention directly, Carroll's argument that "Shakespeare's scepticism about the linguistic sign" (Quirk 1971: 78) is based on a fallacy (1985: 163) may considered as a refutation of the view held by the former. Drawing on Strawson (1950) and Kripke (1980: 256), Carroll (1985: 174-87) conceives a naming practice as a casual chain of reference made up of uses of a name by speakers that have learned to apply it to the same nominatum as did the speaker he or she learned it from. According to Lyons (1977a: 218), a naming convention is learned via what he terms didactic nomination, the use of a name with the express aim of apprising a yet uninitiated addressee of its association with a specific person, place or object. As regards personal names, didactic naming, as the concept will henceforward be expressed, is typically realised either through introductions such as "This is Romeo", or self-introductions such as "My name's Romeo." This chain of communication (Strawson 1950: 336) has its origin in an inaugural imposition of a name on a yet nameless entity which Lyons (1977a: 218) calls performative nomination, the less technical term of which being *baptism*. Baptisms, Carroll argues (1985: 177), are wilful acts but not arbitrary ones.

Although the difference between wilfulness and arbitrariness is not explained, it may be assumed that what is meant by wilfulness is volition, which entails the existence of a motive for the choice of name. Since the imposition of a name on an entity is motivated, the resulting connection cannot be arbitrary, even though many users are unaware of its motivation.

Neither Zabeeh (1968: 4) nor Carroll's argument (1985: 177) for and against the increased arbitrariness of names seems to be based on the meaning *arbitrary* has acquired in linguistics, but rather with the term's more general acceptation of 'randomness.' These divergent points of view nevertheless do enable one to see name-nominatum, and more specifically name-bearer, relations in perspective. They allow one to attribute the unpredictability of *Montague* and *Romeo* with regard to *rose* to the considerably more restricted scope of naming practices in comparison with nominal conventions. Whereas the assignations of *rose* and *man* with the entities they denote are known to the English speech community as a whole, the association of *Romeo* with a specific individual is known only to those acquainted with the bearer. The differences of scope between the two conventions can in turn be put down to the fact that nouns possess lexical meaning while proper names do not. Such considerations fall more within the purview of the lexicological status of nouns and proper names than that of linguistic arbitrariness, and therefore further discussion on this point will be deferred to the following section, in which the grammatical, semantic and pragmatic aspects of naming will be dealt with in more detail.

2.1.3. Arbitrariness in Word-Referent Relations

The realisation that a linguistic expression and the entity it stands for are not only separate but also separable implies that existing designations may be changed by substituting a new term for the current one. In Juliet's soliloquy this possibility is raised by the observation on the preservation of the rose's sweet smell in the event of calling it "by any other name" than *rose*, and the apostrophe addressed to *Montague* "O, be some other name!" The difference is that the statement speculates on the consequences arising from the substitution of one noun for another, and the injunction urges the exchange of one clan name for another. The grammatical realisations of the verb in each clause point to a difference between nouns and names regarding the probability of a change in designation. While imperative *be* suggests a naming practice may be changed with relative ease, conditional *would smell* gives to understand a

change of lexical convention is theoretically possible but highly unlikely in practice. Names, it seems, are more susceptible of being replaced than nouns are.

The possibility of changing designations is also raised in the *Cratylus*. Hermogenes' contention that "the correctness of names is determined by (…) convention and agreement" (1999 [1998]: 2) prompts Socrates, Plato's spokesman in the dialogue, to propose the following hypothesis:

> Suppose I call one of the things that are —for instance, the one we now call 'man'— suppose I give *that*[8] the name 'horse' and give the one we now call 'horse' the name 'man'. Will the same thing have the public name 'man' but the private name 'horse'? (1999 [1998]: 3).

The thrust of the supposition is that, since all designations are established by fiat, a new designation can be created by detaching a linguistic expression from its referent and re-applying it to another one. Although the disputants do not work out the implications of the hypothesis, it is not hard to see that in a scenario in which designations were being changed continually language would cease to be a vehicle of communication. A speaker insisting on using the term *horse* whenever 'man' is meant would be misunderstood by his or her interlocutor, either because the latter still adheres to the public meaning of *horse*, or because he or she has given the noun a different private meaning to the one with which the former uses it.

Juliet's use of the conditional is therefore interpretable as an indication of an awareness of the linguistic anarchy which would ensue from a wholesale change of designations. This interpretation in turn adds a new dimension to the linguistic insight she expresses. Besides laying bare the conventional nature of word-referent relations, the hypothetical dissociation of *rose* from the extra-linguistic entities the term may be applied to underscore the resilience of such relations. Linguistic conventions, like other conventions, can be changed but are nevertheless not changed, at least not as radically as in the scenario inferred from Socrates' hypothesis. A rose will continue to be called a rose, if only because of the need to understand and make oneself understood.

Shakespeare's Juliet turns out to be a far less radical exponent of linguistic arbitrariness than Plato's Hermogenes, who, in accepting Socrates' hypothesis, accepts the implications of his stand on the issue. When it comes to name-bearer relations, however, they seem to be more in accord. As stated above, the rhetorical demand that

[8] Emphasis in the original.

Montague should become a different name suggests established naming practices are more amenable to alteration insomuch as the directive ostensibly presupposes that it is possible for the clan name to change itself. A more feasible, though equally rhetorical, attempt to bring about a change of name is made in the plea that rounds off the soliloquy. The feasibility of exhorting Romeo to "doff thy name" is corroborated by Hermogenes' reference to the custom of renaming chattel slaves to support his conventionalist stance: "when we give names to our domestic slaves, the new ones are as correct as the old" (1999 [1998]: 2). The example demonstrates that giving an person a new name change is not only realisable but also common practice.

Renaming may be regarded as an instance of performative naming defined in 2.1.2 in that it consists in the imposition of a name on the bearer. Since the individual affected already has a name by virtue of his or her official baptism —the legal name (Algeo 1973: 76)— a renaming might be more accurately be said to constitute an instance of secondary performative naming. In the majority of cases, as Morgan et al. (1979: 7-8) point out, renaming does not entail the loss of the name given at primary performative naming, although the frequency of its use is reduced, sometimes significantly. The nicknames and the honorific or occupational titles conferred on an individual all co-exist with his or her legal name, giving rise to a one-to-many relation between the bearer and the various names he or she has accumulated that Morgan et al. (1979: 91) term name density.

The possibility that an individual may be called by more than one name provides only partial confirmation of the greater propensity of name-bearer relations to change in comparison to noun-referent ones. Name density, as seen in the foregoing paragraph, presupposes the co-existence of various names with the baptismal name rather its substitution by a new appellation, as envisaged with Hermogenes' domestic slaves. A baptismal name, in Burgess's words (1992: 394), is "a linguistic construct fastened for life," making its association with the bearer as indissoluble in practice as that of a noun with its referent. Romeo, in compliance with Juliet's wish, might repudiate his clan name for his mistress's, but his adoption of *Capulet* would probably not stop the other citizens of Verona from calling him *Montague*. Ironically, their adherence to the established naming convention would uphold Juliet's observation on the imperviousness of the referent to changes of designation while showing up the futility of the expedient of changing Romeo's name as a way out from the impasse for falling in love with someone from the wrong family. The substitution of *Capulet* for

Montague would not make any difference as to who he is, any more than the substitution of "any other name" for *rose* would curtail the olfactory properties of the rose. Whatever the name he chooses to call himself by, the blood-tie which binds Juliet's lover to his clan would not be severed.

2.1.4. Onomastic Appropriateness

In the discussion on linguistic arbitrariness carried out in the preceding sub-sections attention turned away from the noun to the name, a change of focus paralleled in the contrast of the lines initially cited from Juliet's soliloquy and Burgess's parody of them. On inspecting both, the parody is found to differ from its source in the grammatical realisation of their clause elements, the most significant one for the present purpose being the contrast of the lower with the upper case exhibited by the phrases *a rose* and *the Rose*. The contrast is significant because the different spellings identify each item as a member of a different lexical category: a common noun in the first case, and a proper name in the second. Accordingly, the parodied clause centres specifically on noun-referent relations, and the parody on name-nominatum ones. Whatever linguistic implications the latter may have, these apply primarily to the proper name. To ascertain what these implications are, it is necessary to return to the passages of *A Dead Man in Deptford* from which the two portions of the parody are taken.

In the light of what has been said about Juliet's soliloquy, a second reading of the two passages in question will reveal each to have a bearing on a different aspect of name-nominatum relations. Henslowe's announcement of his intention of having his own playhouse built ends with his naming his prospective playhouse, whereas in the relation of the première of *1 Tamburlaine* the playhouse is referred to by the name he has given it. In other words, the first excerpt represents an impromptu baptism, and the second the observance of the naming convention instituted thereby, followed by an oblique criticism of Henslowe's choice of name. The Narrator implicitly challenges the entrepreneur's claim that *the Rose* is an apt name for his playhouse on the grounds that the offensive odour of the building belies the delicate scent associated with its namesake, a challenge which approaches the issue of name-nominatum relations from the contrary perspective to that of linguistic arbitrariness.

Underlying the Narrator's objection is the conviction, shared though not adequately practised by Henslowe, that there should be a natural correspondence between a name

and its nominatum. "Most names," Nuessel remarks (1992: 4), "are carefully considered so that *exactly the right* name is chosen[9]", a view forcefully formulated in Cratylus' thesis that there is a natural "correctness of names for all things" (1999 [1998]: 1). According to this view, *Hermogenes* would be the naturally correct name for his disputant if, and only if, he were indeed the son of Hermes, which is what the name literally means (1999 [1998]: 43). To be naturally correct, then, a name must not only identify its nominatum, as Hermogenes holds: it must also reflect the nature of its nominatum in some way. Since Hermogenes is not the son of Hermes, *Hermogenes* cannot be regarded as his name because it attributes to its bearer a paternity he does not have. By the same token *the Rose* must also be accounted as a misnomer for a reeking den that stinks "of size and paint and the armpits of the groundlings."

The inappropriateness of Henslowe's choice of name is both highlighted and anticipated by the name given to the playhouse leased to the Burbages:

> I saw Kit for the first time in London at Burbage's theatre, named aptly the Theatre, when I played Bel-Imperia in *The Spanish Tragedy* [p.14].

Since a theatre is a building where stage plays are performed, *the Theatre* is approved of as a naturally correct name in that it reveals the building for what it is: a building where stage plays are performed. In terms of onomastic appropriateness *the Theatre* acts as a foil to *the Rose*.

Its inappropriateness nevertheless does not impede the use of *the Rose* as a designation for Henslowe's playhouse. Whenever he makes reference to it, the Narrator adheres to the naming convention initiated by its proprietor, despite his misgivings about it. The Narrator's enforced conformity to what he considers a malformed convention is vaguely reminiscent of the tone of linguistic pessimism on which the *Cratylus* ends (Barney 2001: 17). Socrates comes across as broadly sympathetic to Cratylus' view but, after examining the issue, is forced to the conclusion that naturally correct names are a desideratum rather than a reality. Although existing naming conventions are in the main malformed, they persist because they are routinely followed out of convenience. For all practical purposes Hermogenes is proved right: "any name you give a thing is its correct name" (1999 [1998]: 1).

[9] Emphasis added.

The normative view on naming Cratylus advocates might be salvaged if a weaker version of onomastic appropriateness is adopted. Lodge (1992: 36) states that every act of performative naming presupposes semantic intent, by which he means that the name-giver's choice of name is influenced by the associations carried by the candidate terms. Seeman identifies various semantic factors at work in name-giving, the most relevant being commemoration (1983: 237-8) and induction (1980: 131; 1983: 239-40). Commemoration is often the motivation behind eponymy: naming somebody or something after a person, object or event that has preceded them is in effect act of remembrance of their namesake (Seeman 1980: 131). Name-giving often seeks to induce in the bearer the desirable qualities suggested by the etymological meaning of the selected name, particularly in the case of personal names, or induce users to associate those qualities with the nominatum. Given the close identification of the bearer with the namesake, a commemorative personal name is often inductive as well in that it is an inducement for the bearer to emulate the traits his or her namesake is most admired for. On this account onomastic appropriateness is based not so much on an actual as a desirable description of its nominatum. When it is given, a name is neither appropriate nor inappropriate: it merely expresses the hope that the nominatum acquires the wished-for qualities suggested by the name. If this hope is fulfilled, then the name is correct.

In the light of the foregoing account of commemorative and inductive naming, *the Rose* may be regarded be an appropriate name for Henslowe's playhouse. To begin with, the identification of the "very pretty rose garden" with the site of the Rose makes the impresario's choice of name an instance of eponymic naming. Once the garden has been cleared away and the playhouse built and opened, *the Rose* counts as a commemorative name in that it serves as a lasting reminder of the rose bushes that once grew on the plot now occupied by the building. The name may even be regarded as inductive if the namesake is considered as a symbol of excellence rather than literally. According to the Renaissance theory of primacy, whereby in every class of being there is one considered to be a primate, the rose enjoys pre-eminence over all other flowers (Tillyard 1943: 42). In naming his playhouse after the floral primate, Henslowe may have had in mind the supremacy of the Rose over the Theatre and the Curtain, the other two public playhouses it has to compete with. On this symbolic interpretation of *rose*, and in view of the box-office success of the plays staged there, *the Rose* turns out to be an appropriate name after all.

2.2. The Lexicological Status of Personal Names

The account just given of linguistic arbitrariness and onomastic appropriateness has left a number of loose ends, not least the lack of precision in the use of the term *name*. Throughout the discussion the distinction between common nouns and proper names was taken for granted while overlooking the fact that in Juliet's soliloquy and the excerpts from the *Cratylus* the term *name* is used indistinctly to refer to items from both word sub-classes. To a large extent this indeterminacy is a reflection of the difficulty in establishing in what the differences between nouns and names consist which Lehrer (1992: 123) alerts us to. The fuzziness of noun-name distinctions in turn is responsible for the much-advertised difficulties which beset all attempts at determining the lexicological status of proper names (Ullman 1957 [1951]: 73 & 1962: 77; Long 1969: 107; Lyons 1977a: 222-3; Markey 1982: 129; Allerton 1987: 62; Crystal 1995: 139). Their intractability to the methods of analysis developed by descriptive linguistics is a widely reported characteristic, especially as regards their morphosyntactic heterogeneity (Jespersen 1924: 69; Gardiner 1954: 21; Sørensen 1958: 156; Long 1969: 109; Chalker 1984: 33; Quirk et al. 1985: 288; Crystal 1991 [1980]: 282) and the vexed question of whether or not they have meanings (Burgess 1975 [1964]: 103; Leech 1981 [1974]: 160; Markey 1982: 138; Clark 1992: 542; Anderson 2004: 434). Having drawn attention to the problems attending the description of proper names, the remainder of this chapter will be devoted to putting the onomastic house in order, with special reference to personal names, the main focus of this thesis. As stated in the introductory chapter, the aim of this review is the relatively modest one of setting up a serviceable theoretical base for the study of naming practices in *A Dead Man in Deptford*, not to provide definitive solutions to issues that do not admit of a simple or universally valid answer (Lyons 1977a: 223).

2.2.1. Onomastic Terminology

Any principled account of names and naming will require a set of unambiguous terms which will enable an accurate description of the elements making up this field of enquiry. The first step towards creating a reasonably watertight nomenclature will be to endow *name*, the key word of the study about to be undertaken, with a precise meaning. Combining Huddlestone (1988: 96) and Bussmann (1996 [1990]: 387), a

proper name may be defined as any linguistic expression which in a given context unequivocally identifies a specific person, place, organisation or, as several commentators have pointed out (Gardiner 1954: 45; Pulgram 1954: 32; Zabeeh 1969: 67; Algeo 1973: 81; Carroll 1985: 3-4; Lehrer 1992: 124), anything else that holds a special interest for the speaker is susceptible of receiving a name institutionalised by an act of performative naming. However, given the number of speakers and the diversity of their interests, practically anything can hold special interest, which means practically anything is susceptible of receiving a name. The almost infinite number of nameable entities entails a large number of onomastic categories of proper names, along with the need to describe them, as well as a broad formal variety of names. The restriction of the present study to personal names simplifies matters somewhat, though this category of proper name also comprises a wide variety of forms and constructions which present a large number of formal differences among them, with the subsequent complication of their formal description. This sub-section will as a result be broken down into two parts, the first concerned with the specialisation of *name* so that the term may be used as a synonym of *proper name*, and the second centred on personal names, more specifically on coining and defining the designations for sub-categories that this class of proper name can be analysed into.

2.2.1.1. *Names and Nouns*

In Juliet's soliloquy *name* makes five token appearances, and in three of these appearances the noun phrase the term forms part of makes reference to another word in the co-text. On two occasions the word referred to is a personal name, *Montague* and *Romeo*, while on the third the referent is a common noun, *rose*. From the excerpts from the *Cratylus* one infers that *name* applies as much to personal names as it does to common nouns: Socrates cites *horse* and *man* as instances of names, and when Hermogenes refers to the custom of changing the names of domestic slaves it is clear that it is personal names that he means. For Shakespeare and Plato, then, a name is any lexical item that can be used refer to an extra-linguistic entity, regardless of whether or not it has originated from an institutionalised act of performative naming.

Further on in Plato's dialogue one notices that its author uses *name* with a much broader meaning than Shakespeare does (Barney 2001: 5). In the extensive passage devoted to the etymologies the application of the term is extended to items as disparate as adjectives (1999 [1998]: 50) and non-finite verbs (1999 [1998]: 52). Plato's overuse

of *name* is attributable to the absence of metalanguage at the time he wrote the *Cratylus* (Ryle 1963: 132). Greek *ὀνομα* was the only metalinguistic term the philosopher had recourse to, corresponding more to Present-Day *word* than *name*, the rendering invariably given to the original term in translations of his work, as evidenced by the two basic functions of language Plato identifies: reference and predication, or, as his Socrates puts it, dividing and giving information on reality (1999 [1998]: 10). The now familiar labels for the various word classes into which vocabulary items are classified were coined by the ancient Greek and Roman grammarians over a century after the composition of the *Cratylus*, among them the class made up of nouns expressly used to identify particulars as opposed to those used to refer to universals. To distinguish the one class from the other, the adjective *κύριον* was placed before the word-class label to identify the former, the resulting noun phrase rendered in Latin as *nomen proprium*, and later in English as *proper name* (Gardiner 1954: 4).

The replacement of *name* by *noun* as a label for the class of lexical items that can be used as heads of noun phrases has not done away with Shakespeare's less precise use of the former term. Paraphrasing the examples Lehrer (1992: 124) gives to illustrate this point, none of the uses of *name* listed below would strike the Present-Day speaker as unnatural, even though only the first corresponds to its primary acceptation:

> William Shakespeare is the name borne by the author of *Romeo and Juliet*
>
> Rose is the name given to a type of thorny, flower-bearing bush
>
> Rose is the name of a colour.

The same indeterminacy is discernible in the definitions given by the Oxford English Dictionary (1978: 13 VII). The first,

> [t]he particular combination of sounds employed as the individual designation of a single person, animal, place, or thing,

describes a name materially as a sequence of phonemes, and functionally as a linguistic label for the univocal identification of its nominatum. However, the second,

> [t]he particular word or words used to denote any object of thought not considered in, or not possessed of, a purely individual character,

contemplates the application of *name* to common nouns, an impression borne out by the citation illustrating this definition,

> [t]he offence, by whatever name called, which if committed in England would be perjury,

in which the noun *perjury* is understood as the name for a criminal offence. The instances just cited corroborate Lehrer's contention that the English language does not distinguish between proper names and common nouns (1992: 124). Further corroboration for this view may be found in the etymology of *noun*, the label for the word class names are thought to form part of. The term is derived, via Old French *non*, from Latin *nomen*, meaning 'name.'

Returning to Juliet's soliloquy, the lines initially quoted from it are generally considered incomplete without the question that precedes it: "What's in a name?" The query directs attention to what Anderson (2004: 435) calls "contentfulness" of names, to what they signify to their users. The ambiguity of *name* evinced in the review of the different applications of the term raises another question, which is: "What is a name?" For the time being the only answer which can be given to this second question, central to the issue of the lexicological status of proper names, is the definition given in the introduction to this sub-section. Precisely what linguistic expressions and constructions answer to this definition, and how these are classified, will be dealt with in the second part.

2.2.1.2. *Core, Mixed and Non-Core Names*

According to the functional, a priori definition given at the beginning of the present sub-section, a proper name is an institutionalised noun phrase for the univocal identification of the entity it refers to. By implication a personal name is a noun phrase which univocally identifies a human being or a so-called honorary human being, the latter being any entity treated as human such as a domestic animal (Allerton 1987: 73). By virtue of their human nominata, genuine or honorary, personal names constitute a distinct class in contrast to proper names with non-human nominata, classifiable under the broad category of non-personal name. Cutting across this notional distinction is a formal division between personal *Francis*, *Walsingham* and *Francis Walsingham* and non-personal *Southwark*, *London* and *England* on the one hand, and personal *the Secretary of State* and non-personal *the Rose* on the other. This second distinction is between name phrases, as noun phrases used for primary reference will henceforward be called, which resemble common noun phrases and those which do not.

The two types of name have excited much comment and been variously termed. Searle (1958: 173; 1969: 174) distinguishes paradigmatic from degenerate proper names, Long (1969: 107) true from phrasal proper names, Quirk et al. (1985: 288) proper nouns from names, and Huddlestone (1988: 96) and Lehrer (1992: 124) proper nouns from proper names. Here Anderson's distinction between core and periphery name (2003: 354) will be adopted, though changing the second term to *non-core*, and grounding the resulting binarism on the principle of prototypicality instead of the anthropocentric bias which originally animated the division. The distinction, in other words, hinges on the existence of a prototype name, an idealised best exemplar against which the names are benchmarked so that those which most resemble the prototype are accordingly considered good or typical exemplars of the class they belong to, and those which least resemble bad or atypical ones (Ungerer and Schmid 1996: 10). The prevalence of the binomial system in Present-Day English naming makes the full name the prototype personal name. The principle of prototypicality allows the identification of a third type of proper name characterised by having both core and non-core components, such as the personal name *The Right Honourable Francis Walsingham*. Following Allerton (1987: 67), this intermediate type of name will be termed "mixed name." From this brief overview it becomes apparent that proper names are arranged along a gradient on which core names shade into mixed names, and these in turn into core names, which merge into common nouns.

2.2.1.2.1. Core Names

A full name such as *Francis Walsingham*, the name of one of characters of *A Dead Man in Deptford* used for exemplification in this section, is analysable into the forename *Francis* (also known as first name, given name, or Christian name) and the family name *Walsingham* (also known as a surname, second name, or last name). As constituents of the prototype name, both forenames and family names are examples of core names. Allerton (1987: 87) refers to forenames as repertory-selected individual names because they are chosen from a pool of semantically emptied items used for the univocal identification of their bearers (Clark 1992: 542). In this they differ from family names in that the latter type of name is not chosen but inherited, traditionally passing down the male line from parent to child. Although both types of core personal name identify the bearer, each does so in a different way to the other. While *Francis* individuates its bearer, *Walsingham* identifies him as a member of a family unit.

Forenames are often the base of derivational operations from which familiar and pet names are obtained. Like most disyllabic or polysyllabic names the familiar form of *Francis* is obtained by eliding the non-stressed syllable, giving *Frank*[10]. The familiar name in turn is the base for the derivation of pet names, normally by means of a diminutive suffix. Thus, the pet form of *Francis* is *Frankie*, *-ie* being the allomorph of the only productive diminutive suffix in Present-Day English, *-y*. As derivatives of a core name, both *Frank* and *Frankie* count as core names as well, as do demotic full names such as *Frank*(*ie*) *Walsingham*. Although family names may undergo clipping and suffixation, the forms obtained from these operations do not have the same degree of conventionality on those applied to forenames, with the result that such forms are better considered as a type of what Morgan et al. (1979: 38) term "internally motivated nicknames," nicknames formed by some kind of word-play on the legal name. Again, being derivatives of a core name, internally motivated nicknames may be regarded as such as well.

2.2.1.2.2. Non-Core Names

As with core names, different types of non-core personal name can be established, although owing to their greater heterogeneity only three types will be considered in this survey. The first are titles, or titular names (Anderson 2003: 362), which provide information about the social identity of their bearers (Ervin-Tripp 1986 [1972]: 221), identifying them in terms of the office (*the Secretary of State*) or dignity (*the Right Honourable Earl of Essex*) they hold, as well as the place they have in the social hierarchy. The second type of non-core name is made up of externally motivated nicknames (Morgan et al. 1979: 39), or characterising names (Room 1989: 4), descriptive phrases which characterise their recipients physically or morally, literally or ironically (Clark 1992: 575). A good example of nicknaming is found near the beginning of *A Dead Man in Deptford*, where Francis Walsingham is reported to have been dubbed *the Moor* on account of his being "a frail dark man" [p.26]. In this case the nickname identifies its recipient by drawing attention to a salient physical trait, namely his unusually dark complexion. Midway between non-core titular names and externally motivated nicknames are instances of antonomasia, a rhetorical device consisting in the substitution of an adjective phrase or noun phrase for a well-known proper name (Cuddon 1979: 50). In the English-speaking world, for instance, *the Bard* without any

[10] In this case the operation is accompanied by the velarisation of syllable-initial /s/.

other qualification is likely to be identified with William Shakespeare. The phrase may be considered as a nickname in that it characterises its recipient in terms of the occupation he is known for, but it may equally be regarded as an honorific title in that the absence of qualification implies that he knows no equal in his art, making him the paradigm example of a poet.

The third type of non-core name is what Anderson (2004: 442), following Zwicky (1974), terms default vocative name. This type of non-core name is definable as a conventionally fixed noun phrase used to address somebody whose identity is unknown to the speaker. This definition excludes vocative non-core titular names because their use is indicative of precise knowledge of the holder's social identity, irrespective of whether his or her legal name is known or not. Terms of endearment or abuse like *my dear* or *you idiot* constitute a borderline case because they are frequently used in contexts where the real identity of the recipient is known. The paradigm example of default name are the polite address forms *sir* and *madam*, corresponding to the polite but socially uninformative titular prefixes *Mr* and *Ms* respectively, as well as the more slighting *whatsyourname*. Other examples of default vocative names include *boy*, *child*, (*my*) *friend*, *girl*, *kid*, *lad*, *man*, *mate*, *old chap* and *pal*, to name just a few examples, all of which are used on an ad hoc basis. Because they are in the main common noun phrases with temporary onomastic status, default vocative names constitute not only the most heterogeneous type of non-core personal name but the most peripheral as well, insofar as they straddle the nebulous noun-name divide.

2.2.1.2.3. Mixed Names

The titular names *Sir Francis Walsingham* and *the Right Honourable Francis Walsingham* count as mixed names because they both contain a core name, *Francis Walsingham*, and a non-typically onomastic component, *Sir* and *the Right Honourable* respectively. Of the two names instanced the second is more peripheral than the first. The nobiliary titular prefix *Sir* is, like a core name, a semantically emptied item that forms part of a closed set of specialised terms denoting each of the different ranks of the aristocracy. Although *the Right Honourable* also belongs to a closed set of titular prefixes, the name it forms part of bears a greater resemblance to a non-core name on account of definite article limiting it.

Besides titular names, there are mixed names consisting of a core name and an epithet, a pre- or post-nominal descriptive phrase characterising the bearer of the names

they are attached to (Cuddon 1979: 241; Wales 1989: 152; Bussmann 1996 [1990]: 150) in the same way as nicknames do. Pre-nominal epithets are usually adjectives which habitually collocate with the core name, such as *kind Kit Marlowe*, the sobriquet John Marston allegedly gave to Christopher Marlowe. Post-nominal epithets, also known as bynames, are either restrictive appositive phrases (*Merlin the atheist* [p.188]) or prepositional phrases (*Will of Warwickshire* [pp.213-4]) which specify the bearer according to parentage, residence, occupation or physical or moral attributes (Clark 1992: 553). By-naming is little used today, and is largely restricted to historical personages such as Richard the Lionheart.

Explicitations such as *the devious Francis Walsingham* and *the privy councillor Francis Walsingham* constitute a special type of by-naming. According to the definition of the term given by Bjørge (2003: 117), making explicit information implied in a core name, the descriptive phrases *devious* and *the privy councillor* help to make *Francis Walsingham* meaningful to somebody that has just been introduced to the name and is assumed to have heard of neither the name nor its bearer. Once explicated, the name occurs without the descriptive phrases in subsequent uses. Explicitation may therefore be regarded as a form of didactic naming in which the explicitation phrases operate in the manner of ad hoc epithets.

The third type of mixed names comprises those consisting of a core name preceded by a term of endearment or abuse. These terms express the feelings the bearer of the core name arouses in the speaker: respect, esteem and affection in the case of terms of endearment, and contempt, antipathy or anger in the case of terms of abuse. Terms of endearment are items from the common vocabulary, mostly adjectives, used to show close emotional involvement such as *dear*, its diminutive form *darling*, *little*, *poor* and *sweet*, to name just a few of the most conventionalised forms. Many relationships develop their own private endearments, often known only to the intimates. Terms of abuse are likewise derived from the common vocabulary, concretely dysphemisms, expressions "with connotations that are offensive either about the denotatum or to the audience, or both" (Allan and Burridge 1991: 26; Allan 1992: 361). The names of animals, for instance, are *ipso facto* dysphemistic when applied to a human referent (Allan 1992: 363), and to call somebody a bitch, cow, pig, sow, worm and so on has traditionally been a much resorted-to means of insulting them. If endearments containing core names may occur with or without introductory *my*, mixed personal names with a dysphemistic element are invariably limited by the demonstrative

determiner *that*, which places a symbolic distance between the speaker and the bearer. Phrases like insulting *that Moor Walsingham* bear a close resemblance to explicitations, although if they are can be considered as equivalent constructions, what is being explicated by *that Moor* is not the identity of the bearer of *Walsingham*, but the speaker's attitude to him.

2.2.2. Morphosyntactic Considerations

What defines a proper name from the morphosyntactic point of view is their idiomaticity (Zwicky 1974: 788). Following Algeo (1973: 20), the properties that make names qua names idiomatic are: they are not subject to determination, they do not inflect to show plural number, and they are not modified by restrictive phrases and clauses. The non-reliance of names on the morphosyntactic operations just enumerated constitutes what Anderson (2003: 353; 2004: 440) terms "primary identification," a property which distinguishes names from nouns in that the latter require at least one of the operations to secure the unequivocal identification of their referents. Non-core names, however, do not meet the criteria defining onomastic idiomaticity, as evidenced by the presence of the definite article and the restrictive prepositional phrase in *the Secretary of State*. In view of this it would seem the description idiomatic is applicable only to core names, or that core and non-core names are idiomatic in different ways. If the latter option is correct, it will then be necessary to ascertain in what way each category of name is idiomatic.

2.2.2.1. *The Idiomaticity of Non-Core Names*

Non-core names are said to be idiomatic because the contrastive grammatical relations normally entered into by their constituents have fallen into abeyance (Quirk et al. 1985: 288; Allerton 1987: 64; Anderson 2003: 357). The noun phrase *the secretary of state* contrasts with *a secretary of state* in definiteness, with *the secretaries of state* in number, and *secretaries of state* in both definiteness and number. Its onomastic cognate, by contrast, does not presuppose **a Secretary of State*, **the Secretaries of State* or **Secretaries of State*, although it can inflect to show the genitive case, as in *the Secretary of State's troubles*. Nor are the nominal elements of non-core names liable to restrictive modification, as attested by the contrast between the unacceptability of **the devious Secretary of State* and the acceptability of *the devious secretary of state*. The same distinction holds between non-core non-personal names

such as *the Rose* and their non-onomastic cognates, although, unlike non-core personal names they are less likely to take the genitive ending.

2.2.2.2. *The Idiomaticity of Mixed Names*

What has been said about the idiomaticity of non-core names applies to mixed names like *the Right Honourable Francis Walsingham*, *Francis the Moor* and *the privy councillor Francis Walsingham*. In the three names enumerated the definite article limiting them is idiomatic in that it does not contrast with the indefinite article: hence the ill-formedness of **a Right Honourable Francis Walsingham*, **Francis a Moor* or **a privy councillor Francis Walsingham* respectively.

Mixed titular names like *Sir Francis Walsingham* stand apart from those mentioned in the preceding paragraph. As suggested in 2.2.1.2.3., the titular prefix *Sir* can be regarded as belonging to a paradigm in the same way the definite article does, with the difference that the meaning conveyed by the prefix is social rather than grammatical. Considered as part of a nobiliary title, *Sir* forms a contrasting pair with *Lord* on the basis of the high/low opposition in relation to rank, precluding their co-occurrence in the same name in the same way *the* pre-empts the co-occurrence of *a*(*n*). This would argue against idiomaticity and for the existence of an underlying principle governing the application of titular prefixes. Since titles are accorded by virtue of the holder's social identity, any attempt to account for this principle would take the present survey into the realm of social deixis and politeness theory, aspects of naming which will be dealt with in the introductory chapter to Part Two, in which names will be considered in terms of their function as honorific forms.

2.2.2.3. *The Idiomaticity of Core Names*

Core names are idiomatic in a different manner to non-core and mixed names. Barring predicative uses (Stidd 2004), such as the subject complement in "he's no Romeo," core names are not as a rule limited by determiners, nor do they inflect to show plural number. Occasionally they do form phrases limited by the distal demonstrative *that*, the first-person possessives *my* and *our*, or the second-person possessive *your*. In such phrases these determiners are indicative of the speaker's demeanour towards the bearer of the name: of exasperation or contempt in the case of *that Francis Walsingham*, of disparaging relinquishment in *your Francis Walsingham*, and of proprietorial affection in *my Francis Walsingham*. As seen in 2.2.1.2.3, the determiners *that* and *my* limit

mixed personal names containing a term of abuse and a term of endearment respectively, linking *my Francis Walsingham* to *my dear Francis Walsingham*, and *that Francis Walsingham* to *that Moor Walsingham*. This symmetry points to the existence of a contrastive relation between the two sets of names, analogous to the *Lord-Sir* binarism seen in 2.2.2.2. The contrast replicates the spatial distinctions normally drawn by the determiners, identifying *that* and *your* with the speaker's distance from the bearer, and *my* and *our* with proximity. However, as Wales (1989: 112) points out, the replication of the spatial opposition involves "a metaphorical, expressive displacement in terms of emotional nearness and distance." Whereas *my* and *our* are expressive of the emotional ties that bind the speaker to the bearer, *that* and *your* are indicative of the differences that separate them, an instance of secondary deixis which also falls within the remit of politeness theory.

2.2.3. Semantic Considerations

According to Anderson (2004: 435), Juliet's query "[w]hat's in a name?" opens the debate over the question of whether names have meaning or not. Lehrer (1992: 123-4) identifies two camps in this debate: the causal theory of names, associated with Mill (1843) and Kripke (1980), which holds that names are meaningless labels which distinguish their respective nominata from one another; and the descriptive theory, associated with Russell (1905) and Searle (1958; 1969), which conceives a name as a kind of umbrella term under which all the descriptions which can be made of its nominatum can be subsumed. The issue is moreover complicated at the outset by the polysemy of *meaning*, one of "the most eminently discussable terms in the English language" (Leech 1981 [1974]: 1). As a result, the survey on the semantics of naming must necessarily be carried out with reference to the different types of meaning there are, four being the types to be seen: lexical, referential, etymological and connotative.

2.2.3.1. *Lexical Meaning*

When it is argued proper names have no meaning, what is generally meant is that they lack lexical meaning. Lexical meaning is more or less synonymous with denotation, "the constant, abstract, and basic meaning of a linguistic expression independent of context and situation" (Bussmann 1996 [1990]: 118), and for this reason is also known as conceptual (Leech 1981 [1974]: 9) or denotative (Wales 1989: 113-4) meaning. This would explain why, as seen in 2.1.2, *Romeo* can only be described

metalinguistically as a male personal name while *man* can be defined as ‘adult male human’ as well as described as a common count noun.

The absence of lexical meaning is due to the semantic emptying core names have undergone in their conversion from items of the common vocabulary to proper names. The forename *Francis*, for instance, is a reflex of Latin *Franciscus*, meaning ‘Frank’ or ‘Frenchman’ (Pickering 2004 [1999]: 124). Yet although “names come ready-made with etymological meaning” (Seeman 1983: 239), ‘Frenchman’ does not define *Francis* as ‘adult human male’ defines *man*. The bearers of the name need have not been born in France to be entitled to it while the referents of *man* must be, excepting figurative uses of the noun, adult male humans. Even if they were aware of the etymology of the name, no one would suppose a person called *Francis* to be French, any more than they would expect to see cattle fording the river at Oxford or automatically assume Mr Butcher to be in the meat trade (Clark 1992: 542).

The above account on the desemanticisation undergone by names has centred on core names. This inevitably begs the question of whether the conclusions arrived at are applicable to mixed and non-core names as well. Since they contain items from the common vocabulary, the latter categories of name cannot be said to be totally lacking in operative semantic content. The titular names *the Secretary of State, the Right Honourable Francis Walsingham* and *Sir Francis Walsingham* all rely on lexical meaning for the identification of their bearer, though to varying degrees. The non-core name not only identifies the present holder of an official post, it also gives an idea of the responsibilities and duties which come with his office through the lexical meanings of the nouns contained in the name. The mixed titular names also identify the bearer via his status, although more obliquely. In the first the evaluative content of *Honourable*, enhanced by the intensifying *Right*, identifies him as a member of the Privy Council through the respect due to the bearer by virtue of his high office, whereas in the second the titular prefix *Sir* indicates that the bearer has been knighted in reward for services rendered. More than the morphosyntactic features examined in 2.2.2, then, it is the lack of semantic content that distinguishes core names from mixed and non-core names. Within the category of mixed names one finds, in addition to its greater resemblance to a common noun phrase, that a name like *the Right Honourable Francis Walsingham* is more peripheral than *Sir Francis Walsingham* on account of the greater prominence of lexical meaning in the former. As the meanings conveyed

by titular prefixes like *Sir* are social rather than descriptive, a mixed titular name limited by a specialised titular prefix may be considered as almost a core name.

The degree to which lexical meaning impinges on the identification of their nominata suggests that non-core names correspond more to Cratylean standards of correctness than core names, at least as regards to personal names. Provided that the person it is applied to is indeed the present holder of the office described, *the Secretary of State* is a more accurate identification of its bearer than *Francis Walsingham* is insomuch as the bearer of the full name is neither French nor a native of the Norfolk village his family name is derived from. This would seem to be particularly true of nicknames and epithets in that they are motivated by the occupation of the bearer's occupation, provenance or physical, psychological or behavioural traits. Even ironic nicknaming, such as, say, calling somebody with an unusually fair complexion *the Moor*, upholds onomastic appropriateness by flouting the principle in the expectation that the inconsistency will be noticed. Nicknaming, together with by-naming, may regarded as a means of offsetting the *de facto* validity of established naming conventions by replacing legal names with ones which reflect the qualities of the individuals they are imposed on. Used literally, a nickname comes nearer to the naturally correct name posited in the *Cratylus* insomuch as it provides a description of the bearer, albeit a subjective one.

The broadening of the scope of the survey to include non-personal names will nevertheless throw up instances of non-core names which do not give adequate descriptions of their nominata. Looking back at the second of the two excerpts from *A Dead Man in Deptford* with which this chapter began, one cannot but conclude that the definition of a core name as an item empty of semantic content is applicable to *the Rose* as well. On the strength of this example there is no perfect fit between the formal differences that distinguish core from non-core names on the one hand, and the lack and possession of semantic content on the other. While all core names can be said to be devoid of lexical meaning, not all non-core names have semantic content.

2.2.3.2. *Referential Meaning*

The seminal formulation of the causal theory of names is Mill's contention that "names are connotative; they denote the individuals who are called by them; but they do not indicate or imply attributes as belonging to those individuals" (quoted in Pulgram 1954: 33). Bearing in mind that by *connote* he means 'signify' and *denote*

'refer,' the thrust of Mill's thesis is that core names lack lexical meaning but possess referential meaning, the relation of a linguistic entity with the extra-linguistic entity it is applied to (Wales 1989: 396; Crystal 1991 [1980]: 293-4).

Referential meaning is a property name phrases share with noun phrases, although there are pronounced differences in the way each word class manifests this property. Whereas a noun relies on determination and restrictive modification for the correct identification of its referent, a core name, as implied in the introduction to 2.2.2, can identify its nominatum without recourse to either. The correct identification of the bearer of *Francis Walsingham* rests solely on the shared assumption that the name applied to him is indeed the one that has been given to him, an assumption in turn grounded on prior applications of the name to the same individual on the part of the speaker and addressee (Anderson 2004: 440).

The fact that both names and nouns have referential meaning has led some students to confuse lexical for referential meaning. Padučeva (1970: 226) states that "even proper names serve not only to refer to an object but also to some constant property of that object," defining *John* as 'a person who responds to a call *John*!' to make the point. This is echoed by Leech's statement that *Daphne* "is best defined semantically simply as 'the one named *Daphne*'" (1980 [1974]: 160). Burgess (1975 [1964]: 103), while endorsing Mills's view that names are "merely laundry marks," expands on this definition slightly with the pronouncement that "'Theodore' (…) means all people called Theodore taking the widest context; taking the narrowest, it means all the people called Theodore whom we happen to know or know about." The first objection that can be made against these definitions is that they are descriptions of the bearers of *John*, *Theodore* and *Daphne* rather than definitions of the names. More importantly, Padučeva, Burgess and Leech overlook the fact that references can only be made in utterances, and as a result referential meaning is not so much a semantic as a pragmatic concern, more specifically in the realm of deixis. Describing *John* as 'a person who responds to a call *John*!' makes no sense when the name is considered solely as a linguistic token. On the other hand, *man* can be defined semantically as 'adult male human' both in abstraction and in an utterance. Unlike a noun, which conserves its lexical meaning regardless of whether it is being used or not, a name only acquires meaning when it is applied to an entity.

2.2.3.3. *Connotative Meaning*

Leech (1981 [1974]: 12) defines connotative meaning as the significance a linguistic expression has by virtue of its referent, over and above its semantic content. Juliet's reference to the rose through one of its physical attributes instead of the noun that denotes it illustrates connotation in common nouns: a rose is more an entity that gives off a sweet smell than a thorny flower-bearing bush. Zabeeh's reading of her soliloquy draws attention to how the enmity between Capulets and Montagues invests her lover's name with the meaning of 'enemy' (1968: 3): "'T is but thy name that is my enemy." First *Montague* and then *Romeo* become synonyms of *enemy*, identifyng their bearer as one that hates and is hated by their user. Mill's observation on proper names can consequently be amended so that they may defined as initially meaningless linguistic marks that become meaningful on account of the personal associations they acquire for their users: hence the paradox that names are at the same time meaningful and meaningless (Gardiner 1954: 32). A core name may lack semantic content, but this does not mean they hold no significance for their users. Zabeeh (1968: 3) resolves the paradox by attributing a dual function to names, those of label and connotation.

Juliet's perplexity on discovering she has fallen in love with a man from a rival clan also illustrates the instability of connotative meaning in contrast to the relative stability of lexical meaning (Leech 1981 [1974]: 12). To a large extent her confusion is occasioned by the clash of two rival sets of connotations. On the one hand there are the negative associations attached to *Montague* she inherits from the Montague-Capulet feud, and on the other the positive associations arising from the favourable impressions caused by the bearer. The contradictory meanings her lover's name has for Juliet are determined by non-linguistic criteria: first her preconceived ideas of the bearer on account of his background, and then her opinion of him on personal acquaintance. Initially vitiated by its association with *Montague*, because of its acquired meaning 'enemy,' *Romeo* picks up connotations of sweetness. Despite, or because of, their lack of lexical meaning, core names are often rich in connotative meanings.

The propensity of core names to acquire connotations supports the descriptive theory of proper names. The definition Searle gives of names, "pegs on which to hang descriptions" (1958: 172; 1969: 173), rests on the relation of co-referentiality that obtains between the name and the definite descriptions applied to its nominatum. *Romeo,* for example, is co-referential with descriptive phrases such as *a citizen of*

Verona, *the son and heir of the Montagues*, *the lover of Juliet*, *the friend of Mercutio*, *the slayer of Tybalt*, *a lovelorn youth*, *a man of divided loyalties* and *a man on the run*, to name just the first that come to mind. The sum of all the descriptive phrases that are applied to the bearer, according to Searle, would make up the meaning, or meanings, of *Romeo*. As the phrases enumerated are descriptions of the bearer, the meanings they endow the name with are connotative, in accordance with Leech's definition of connotation. That the descriptions often contradict one another does not necessarily detract from this label-connotation view of core names: it merely points up the fact that the same name suggests different things to those who know, or know of, the bearer. For Juliet *Romeo* evokes a tender lover; for her kinsfolk, by contrast, the name connotes a heartless seducer and cold-blooded murderer.

2.2.4. Pragmatic Considerations

Firstly, before going on to look at the pragmatic dimension of proper names, it is convenient to make clear that in this sub-section the term *pragmatic* and its derivatives will be used in the extremely narrow sense of how names are used as referring expressions and vocatives. Secondly, this qualification necessarily results in definitively reducing the scope of the survey to personal names. Up till now names have been seen largely in terms of their use for third-person reference, ignoring their use as vocatives, that is, as expressions which refer directly to the addressee. While third-person reference is a function performed by personal and non-personal names alike, second-person reference can only be made by personal names. Save for apostrophe, or rhetorical reference to an addressee that cannot respond, non-personal names are not used vocatively, which makes the vocative function a property which distinguishes personal from non-personal names. And it goes without saying that if non-personal names do not perform a vocative function, common nouns do not either, again with exception of the poetic licence of apostrophe. For the sake of economy the term *reference* and its derivatives will henceforward be used with the restricted meaning of third-person reference, reserving the term *vocative* and its derivatives for second-person reference.

2.2.4.1. *Referential and Vocative Uses of Core Names*

If the vocative function distinguishes personal from non-personal names, the way this function is carried out distinguishes personal core names from personal mixed and

non-core ones. Thus, personal core names are definable pragmatically as linguistic expressions having both vocative and referential use (Zwicky 1974: 787; Lyons 1977: 216). *Romeo* is used vocatively in "Romeo, doff thy name" and "[t]hree words, dear Romeo, and good night indeed" (*Romeo and Juliet* II ii. 142), and referentially in its first token appearance in "[s]o Romeo would, were he not Romeo called." The two instances of vocative use cited illustrate the two vocative functions Zwicky (1974: 787) identifies, namely calls, or summonses (Levinson 1983: 71), and addresses. In the first example *Romeo* is a call to catch the attention of its bearer, whereas in the second the name is an address to maintain his attention. What also merits interest is that the full name, the prototypically personal name, is rarely used for reference, and avoided for calls and vocative address on the grounds that in the latter uses it comes across as peremptory or overbearing.

As indicated by the commas which isolate *Romeo* and *dear Romeo*, names used vocatively are extraneous to the utterances they co-occur with. The punctuation is indicative of the distinctive sound (Gardiner 1954: 37), or paralinguistic modulation (Lyons 1977a: 217), which sets calls and vocative addresses apart from their phonological environment. Downing (1969: 577) links their distinctive intonational contour to the unique meaning vocative names are invested with, a correlation seemingly borne out by Lyons's observation that names used referentially also have distinctive intonation, though not as pronounced as that given to names used vocatively (1977a: 217). The intonational foregrounding of names used vocatively suggests that they constitute a free-standing utterance, an impression borne out by the fact that *Romeo* and *dear Romeo* may be uttered without the accompaniment of any other utterance. This in turn suggests that calls and vocative addresses are akin to exclamatives, that is: emotional utterances lacking the grammatical structure of a full sentence and marked by strong intonation (Crystal 1991: [1980]: 127). Depending on the tone given to it, the call in "Romeo, doff thy name" may convey an impassioned plea, a peremptory command or a friendly invitation.

2.2.4.2. *Referential and Vocative Uses of Non-Core Names*

Unlike core names, which have a single form to perform both vocative and referential functions, non-core names develop different forms to carry out each function. In the case of names resembling definite noun phrases, the vocative is formed simply by dropping the definite article, as can be appreciated by the comparison of the invocation

in “Lord, you are my hope” to its referential counterpart in the declaration “The Lord is my hope” (quoted in Downing 1969: 576). This suggests the existence of a contrastive relation between vocative *Lord* and referential *the Lord*: the presence of the article indicates that the titular name makes reference to its bearer, and its absence that it is used as a summons or address. In like manner pre-nominal phrases containing the definite article shed it when the name it forms part of is used vocatively. For example, a Catholic priest referred to as *the Reverend Father John Ballard*, the full titular name of another of the characters of *A Dead Man in Deptford*, will be addressed as (*Reverend*) *Father Ballard*. It is interesting to note the avoidance of the full name in the vocative form of the latter name.

Turning to default vocative names, these are characterised by the absence of a corresponding referential form regarded *stricto sensu* as a personal name. The referential counterparts to *sir* and *madam*, for instance, are the definite noun phrases *the gentleman* and *the lady*. To facilitate the correct identification of their referents, however, the respective heads of these phrases have to occur with restrictive modification, which deprives them of onomastic status in that this does not meet the third of the morphosyntactic criteria defining the idiomaticity of non-core names. The other two criteria, the absence of determination and resistance to the plural inflection, are not fulfilled either: *the gentleman/lady* contrasts with *a gentleman/lady* in definiteness, and with *the gentlemen/ladies* in number. On the other hand the plural forms of these nouns, without determination, are used for plural address, as evidenced by the general call for attention *Ladies and gentlemen*. Most other default vocatives take the plural number so that they have a form for plural as well as singular address, setting up contrastive relations such as the one observable in the greetings *Hello, boy* and *Hello, boys*. Default vocative names may therefore regarded as a type of defective personal name insomuch as they only carry out one of the two functions performed by this class of proper name, although they function they do perform is precisely the property which defines personal names against non-personal names, endowing them with onomastic status.

2.2.4.3. *Vocative and Referential Uses of Mixed Names*

The vocative and referential use of mixed names has already been touched on in 2.2.4.2 with respect to titular names like *the Right Honourable Francis Walsingham*. Mixed names containing epithets, by contrast, are only used referentially, the vocative

function being carried out either by the core name or the pre-nominal epithet in the manner of a nickname. As regards mixed titular names consisting of a titular prefix and a full name, the general rule is that for reference there is a choice between the full titular name and the titular prefix and family name, whereas for vocative calls and addresses the latter construction should be used. Accordingly, anybody referred to as *Father* (*John*) *Ballard*, *Captain* (*John*) *Fortescue*, *Mr* (*Thomas*) *Walsingham*, and so on, must be called or addressed as *Father Ballard*, *Captain Fortescue* and *Mr Walsingham* respectively. An exception to this is the titular name given to somebody that holds a knighthood: for reference the full titular name is used, *Sir Francis Walsingham*, while the titular prefix followed by the forename, *Sir Francis*, is used for vocative calls and addresses. Some titular prefixes may be used as free-standing vocative names, particularly in situations where the holder's legal name is not known to the speaker. Accordingly a Catholic priest can be addressed orally as *Father*, and a soldier holding the rank of captain by *Captain*. What remains constant is the avoidance of the full titular name for vocative use, possibly because such uses are perceived as peremptory or rude.

2.2.5 The Affinity of Common Nouns with Proper Names

Throughout the discussion on the lexicological status of proper names, and in particular personal names, reference has been made to the fact that they are ultimately derived from the common vocabulary of the language. Default names, which for the most part are noun phrases doubling as personal names, serve as a lasting reminder of the process whereby a linguistic expression gradually sheds its semantic content so that it can be used for the primary identification of a specific entity. The process has been seen to be more complete with core than non-core names, although, as the example of *the Rose* illustrates, names of the latter class are not totally exempt from desemanticisation. If the provenance of proper names suggests a bond of affinity with the common vocabulary, recoverable through their etymology, then the reverse process, the conversion of names into items possessing lexical meaning, strengthens that bond and upholds the view that there is no real distinction between them. The final part of this section, then, will centre on how an item from one category metamorphoses into one from another, dealing first with the transformation of nouns into names, and then the derivation of nouns from names.

2.2.5.1. *Noun into Name*

The Narrator's wry comment that "[t]he Rose smelt of no roses" not only contrasts Henslowe's playhouse with its namesake, it also sets the onomastic status of *the Rose* in opposition to the non-onomastic status of the noun the name is derived from. The comparison of the stench given off by the theatre, "rather still of size and paint and the armpits of the groundlings," with the fragrance connoted by *roses* invests the name with a radically different set of associations. The negative olfactory connotations picked up the name in turn point to a more substantial semantic difference arising from the desemanticisation of *rose* attending its conversion into a proper name. Once *the Rose* has been accepted as the designation of public playhouse, the lexical meaning of its non-onomastic cognate is no longer applicable because none of the semantic features contained in the meaning corresponds to the characteristics borne by the nominatum of the new name. As a name, moreover, *the Rose* does not develop a new meaning to replace the one that has been lost, since its purpose is to distinguish its nominatum from other buildings, especially those devoted to the same purpose the Rose is put to. Despite its formal similarity to definite noun phrases, *the Rose* is as empty of semantic content as core names such as *London*, *Francis* and *Walsingham*.

The co-occurrence, in the two extracts from *A Dead Man in Deptford*, of *the Rose* with the expression it is derived from is also a reminder of the non-onomastic origin of names. The first fragment depicts the institution of a naming convention involving the appropriation of a common noun and its imposition on the prospective playhouse, and the second the observance of the instituted naming convention. What is missing is the transition phase in which noun phrase loses its lexical meaning and becomes a name. The gap can be filled in with a third excerpt from the novel, which conveniently occurs between the other two:

> Alleyn was with Henslowe and Peter Street the master builder, sniffing roses and stringing lines on earth cruelly stripped of its bushes [p.35].

At one level, Henslowe establishes a new convention by re-assigning *rose* to the playhouse he plans to build inspired by the rose bushes growing on the site, and the Narrator complies with the convention thereby instituted by referring to the finished playhouse by the name its proprietor has given it. On this account, the removal of the rose bushes to make way for the building named after them illustrates the loss of the name model and the resulting opaqueness of the name. The site cleared of the roses, future theatre-goers will be ignorant of how the playhouse got its name so that the

connection between *the Rose* and its nominatum is for all practical purposes unmotivated. At another level, the three extracts represent the passage of *rose* from noun to name, with the loss of semantic content attending the process. The process of semantic emptying observed in *the Rose* is reminiscent of Mill's account of the loss of motivation in the place name *Dartmouth* in support of the conventionalist view of naming (quoted in Gardiner 1954: 2; Stidd 2004: 179). The town of Dartmouth receives its name from its location, on the mouth of the river Dart. Once established as its name, *Dartmouth* will identify the town, even though the mouth of the river should silt up, or change its course, or the town change location. The removal of the roses from the building site does not necessitate changing the name of the playhouse either, as its purpose is to ensure the identification of its nominatum rather than provide an accurate description of it.

Viewed together, the three extracts trace, in a compressed form, a diachronic process which lasts several generations. The desemanticisation undergone by *the Rose* invites comparison to the process whereby bynames, or post-nominal epithets, became family names, core names which co-exist with their non-onomastic cognates. As stated in 2.2.1.2.3, bynames are defined as restrictive phrases which supplement baptismal names to aid the identification of their bearers, and which fall into four semantic categories: familial, occupational, locative and characterising (Clark 1992: 567). The transmission of occupation, abode or physical appearance from father to son maintains the literal applicability of the byname, ensuring its retention in the family in successive generations. Once the byname has ceased to be a true description or characterisation of the bearer, because of change of occupation or residence, but continues to be transmitted, it ceases to be a byname to become a family name (1992: 579). As the new purpose of the name is to identify a familial unit, its original lexical meaning becomes irrelevant and is lost. The same process is undergone by forenames, only it is a far more protracted one and, in the case of the English naming system, obscured by the importation of names from other languages, with the result that most forenames are made meaningful in the denotative sense through translation rather than their non-onomastic cognates.

2.2.5.2. *Name into Noun*

The irony in "[t]he Rose smelt of no roses" trades not so much on what *rose* denotes as what the noun connotes. In calling his playhouse *the Rose*, Henslowe transfers the

olfactory connotations of the noun to the name, a transfer which renders it an inappropriate name. Core personal names, as argued in 2.2.3.3, are more prone to pick up connotations, an important source of the associations they acquire being their bearers, strongly suggested by the inductive intention animating eponymic naming (Seeman 1983: 239). Besides influencing choice of name, the connotative meanings names have also play an important role in their transformation into items of the common vocabulary, the reverse process whereby *the Rose* and *Dartmouth* are transformed from noun phrases to proper names.

In the discussion on the idiomaticity of core personal names, in 2.2.2.3, passing mention was made of the predicative use of core names, illustrated by the evaluation *He's no Romeo*. The use of *Romeo* in this utterance is described as predicative because it does not identify the bearer of the name but predicates a quality of him, in this case romantic ardour. Such usage is an instance of deferred reference, which Ward (2004: 262) defines as "the metonymic use of an expression to refer to an entity related to, but not denoted by the conventional meaning of that expression." In other words, *Romeo* ultimately makes reference to the romantic ardour its bearer is assumed to have but the referent of *he* lacks. As Stidd would put it (2004: 182), the name epitomises romantic ardour, that is, it conveys the meaning 'romantic ardour' so that the utterance can be paraphrased "he is no ardent lover."

Epitomisation, as Stidd construes it (2004: 182-8), is a form of conversion whereby a core name is used as a common noun to refer "some salient attribute" possessed by its bearer. An epitomised name is one that has acquired semantic content. To ascertain the intended meaning of *He's no Romeo*, however, the recipient of the utterance must know that Shakespeare's Romeo is the epitome of the ardent lover so that *Romeo* evokes romance every time it is heard. Instrumental in the epitomisation of core name are the connotations they acquire, particularly the most prominent and widely known ones. Of all the associations that have become attached to *Romeo* those of romance and ardour are among the first to spring to mind on hearing the name. Epitomisation is therefore definable as the conversion of connotative into lexical meaning for the purposes of deferred meaning.

In the majority of cases core names are epitomised on an ad hoc basis, although there are syntactic frames which encourage epitomisation. In addition to negative equative sentences, a good example of such a reference-deferring frame is the verb-object structure *to do a* _____, meaning to act or behave in a way typical of the person

bearing the epitomised name placed in the slot, usually to convey disapproval or make fun. For instance, *to do a Romeo and Juliet* can be a mocking reference to a young couple who have married in the teeth of parental opposition, who have killed themselves for love, or who have done any other action the Shakespearean characters are renowned or notorious for. On the other hand, when the bearer of the epitomised name has historical, political or cultural prominence, the temporary lexical meaning it is endowed with can become permanent so that the name becomes part of the common vocabulary (Pulgram 1954: 20; Lyons 1977a: 220). This is the case of Romeo, whose status as the archetype of the youthful, handsome, passionate lover has not only made him a byword for romantic love (Partridge 1970 [1949]: 369), but also transformed the originally connotative meaning of *Romeo*, 'attractive, passionate male seducer or lover' (NED 1998: 1611), into a dictionary definition[11]. Once its semantic content is fixed, the meaning of the eponymous noun can be learned like the meanings of any other noun, with the result that it can be used by speakers that have never heard of the eponym (Stidd 2004: 179).

2.3. Recapitulation

Neither the lines quoted from *Romeo and Juliet* is about a rose, nor the parody assembled from the extracts from *A Dead Man in Deptford* about the Rose. Rather, the one is about a set of entities called *rose*, and the other an entity named *the Rose*. Both clauses therefore start from the premise that an entity and the expression designating it are separate objects brought and held together by convention. However, they both also conclude that, although the separateness of the expression in theory allows for its alienation from its referent, in practice the inertia of convention precludes their dissociation. Shakespeare presents the separation of *rose* from its referent as an unrealisable hypothesis. At first sight Burgess's depiction of the re-assignation of the noun to a different entity constitutes the actualisation of that hypothesis, but in reality the name-nominatum relation resulting from the re-assignation is as indissoluble as the noun-referent relation Shakespeare singles out. The association of a linguistic expression with an extra-linguistic entity is in theory analysable, but for all practical purposes the associated elements are inalienable.

[11] The derivation of eponymous adjectives such as *Shakespearean* may also involve epitomisation. The adjective phrase in *a typically Shakespearean understanding of human nature*, for instance, presupposes not only the attribution of empathy to the bearer of *Shakespeare* but an identification of empathy with the bearer that is so close that the quality is evoked every time the name is evoked.

The re-classification of the noun as a proper name depicted in the parody draws attention away from denotation to naming. This change of focus raises a series of questions on word-entity relations not touched on by Shakespeare, although restricted to proper names. These questions comprise the relations of the name-giver and name-user with the named, the motivation behind the choice of name and the relations of the named with its namesake, as well as the semantic status of names, their appropriateness and their relation with common nouns. Above all, Burgess's concern with naming throws into relief how the inalienability of the name from its nominatum contributes to the fatefulness the former has for the latter (Morgan et al. 1979: 10). The lifelong association of the name with the bearer, allied to their lack of lexical meaning, is what makes names prone to acquiring connotations as to make them an emblem of how their users see their respective bearers. The various connotations a name collects are also fastened to its bearer, together with the name itself. Juliet's soliloquy illustrates the ineluctable nature of the bearer's connection with his or her name and the associations attached to it (Zabeeh 1968: 3).

In alluding to the soliloquy, Burgess not only picks up and expands on the linguistic intuitions they contain: he also transfers the tragic import of the soliloquy into his own novel. Marlowe as depicted in *A Dead Man in Deptford* is conditioned as much by his name as Romeo and Juliet are by their respective clan names. The lovers are unable to escape the associations of vendetta connoted by *Montague* and *Capulet*, whereas the free-thinking poet and playwright is unable to prevent *Christopher Marlowe* from becoming a byword for intemperance, sodomy and atheism.

The connotations that a name picks up is bound up with the issue of the polysemy of *name*. This comprises the use of the term as a synonym for *reputation* and its application to common nouns as well as proper names. The resulting ambiguity redirects Juliet's original query from "what's in a name?" to "what is a name?" Each question can be related to one of the two constituent parts of the linguistic expression, the latter to its form and the former to its content. Each question suggests two lines of enquiry for the study of names in Burgess's novel: the significance a name may have, and their formal features. Following the lead set by these two questions, then, the first part of this thesis will be devoted to the name as an acoustic form and as a carrier of meaning.

3. Exploiting Phonological Features of Personal Names for Stylistic Effect

Neither of the two questions educed in the rundown of the linguistic commentary of Juliet's soliloquy carried out in the previous chapter —"What's in a name?" and "What is a name?"— is explicitly framed in *A Dead Man in Deptford*. Yet they both have an implicit but pervasive presence in the novel so that they may be regarded an integral part of the themes explored in the novel.

As a point of departure one may take John Ballard's pronouncement that a "name is what we hear ill and, alas, write ill" [p.58], which seems to answer the second of the two questions posed. According to this answer, a name is an unstable sequence of phonemes and graphemes, or, to put it in Saussurean terms, a signifier without a signified. This rather reductionist definition of *name* bears out the conventionalist view that proper names are arbitrary labels which identify their respective nominata without communicating anything about them. The focus brought to bear on the name as an acoustic form nevertheless serves as a reminder of their material affinity with other linguistic expressions, a point forcefully made by Gardiner (1954: 7) and Derrida (Schalkwyk 2000: 171). Like other linguistic expressions names are analysable into phonemes that fall into distinctive patterns.

A candidate answer to the first question is Marlowe's pun on the etymological meaning of his forename:

> I have a great name, though not many call me by it. I bear Christ on my back. And who or what is Christ [p.252]?

The titular name borne by Jesus of Nazareth might be said to be in *Christopher* in the sense that it is one of the two constituent elements that make up the compound. In another regard, however, the utterance may be construed as a reformulation of the question originally put by Juliet to the extent that the wording of the utterance adds a note of ambivalence to the etymology of Marlowe's forename. As well as 'bearer of Christ,' the etymological meaning of *Christopher* may be rendered as 'bearer of *Christ*.' In the latter rendering the constituent element is interpreted as a citation form, which defers rather than resolves the question of the significance of the name it forms part of because the recourse to etymology begs the question of the meaning(s) conveyed by *Christ*. Marlowe's rueful meditation on the import of his name may therefore be condensed into "What's in *Christopher*?"

Each of the two extracts just cited is indicative of a salient feature of the novel under review. At one level, *A Dead Man in Deptford* may be read as a sustained exercise in wordplay, in many cases involving personal names, in particular *Kit*. Ballard's

definition of name suggests paronomasia, wordplay which trades on similarity of sound for its effect. Indeed, owing to the mock-euphuistic style it is written in, Burgess's fictional memoir is to be read as much with the ear as the eye, in part the result of the phonological bonding of items which occur in the same co-text. Although also weighted towards form, the pun on Marlowe's forename points to the relevance of meaning in word-play. As Wales (1989: 385) points out, the whole point of punning is to bring together different meanings through the phonetic correspondences of the expressions that convey them. Since much of the word-play in the novel involves personal names, punning may be viewed as a means of drawing significance from them.

The object of this chapter, then, is to introduce the basic concepts pertaining to the exploitation of the phonological features names have in common with other linguistic items, illustrating them with an example taken from the title of the novel. The illustration is meant to prepare for the analysis of the phonological pairing of *Kit* with other items be carried out in the subsequent chapters of this first part.

3.1. The Creation of Phonological Schemes through Paronomasia

Paronomasia can be subsumed under the broader rhetorical category of schemes, figures of speech which order units into regular patterns (Wales 1989: 413). The principle behind schemes is that of repetition, two main types of scheme being identified according to the extension of the repetition. The first type consists in the exact copying of a word, phrase or clause, or free repetition (Leech 1969: 77); the second, the partial repetition of a structure, or parallelism. These patterns of repetition are, as may be inferred from this account, discernible at different levels of analysis. As paronomasia occurs at the phonological level, it consists in the repetition and patterning of sounds within the syllable, giving rise to the distinction between grammatical and lexical schemes on the one hand, and phonological schemes on the other (Leech 1969: 77). Phonological schemes fall into the two types identified above, phonological free repetition and phonological parallelism. Both types of phonological scheme are found in *A Dead Man in Deptford*, and each will briefly be described in this section with a view to identifying the various patterns which will be examined in the course of the analysis.

3.1.2. Free Phonological Repetition

Free phonological repetition consists in the reiteration of the same phoneme sequence, be it a syllable or a word. Reduplication, however, does not necessarily mean that

there is an absolute equivalence between the repeated units. Following Pennock (2000: 50), three types of repetition can be distinguished: identity of form among the token appearances of a word with lexical and referential equivalence, identity of form with lexical but without referential equivalence, and identity of form only. As core names do not have lexical meaning, it is more proper to speak of identity of form with or without referential equivalence.

For exemplification of the two types of repetition just enumerated affecting core names we may turn to the following passage from the novel:

> Watson dug a shilling from his purse. Kit yelled for Tom. Watson started. But Tom was no uncommon name. The Tom that entered was a boy, tousled and with an incisor missing, bare feet filthy, in cast-off trunks and jerkin too large [p.9].

While the two token appearances of *Kit* and *Watson* unequivocally involve identity of form with referential equivalence, the three appearances of *Tom* involve identity of form only. The first and second occurrences of the familiar name are not co-referential because the equational relation of the latter *Tom* with *no uncommon name* identifies the name as a citation form. Neither is there real referential equivalence between the first and third occurrences, even though the name phrase *Tom* is co-referential with the noun phrase *The Tom that entered*. The non-equivalence of *Tom* is due to the predicative use of the name in the name phrase, which, in the light of the paraphrase of the name as *the boy that Kit called by the name of* Tom, is to be regarded as a citation form as well. As citation forms, moreover, the second and third token appearances of *Tom* do not have referents so that in their case the question of referential equivalence falls into abeyance. Since co-reference emerges as the principal criterion for the distinction of one type of repetition from the other, the repetition of a lexical item will be classified into equivalent and non-equivalent. The first class involves identity of form with both lexical and referential equivalence, whereas the second involves identity of form with lexical but without referential equivalence and identity of form without either lexical or referential equivalence.

The confusion over who Marlowe is calling for is revelatory of the status of personal names as multi-designatory expressions (Grodzinski 1980: 10), suggested by the description of *Tom* as "no uncommon name." By multi-designatory what is meant the one-to-many relation between name and bearers[12], a relation which makes names

[12]Multi-designatory expression is the reverse of Morgan et al.'s notion of name density, the many-to-one relation between names and bearer (see 2.1.3). Grodzinski's term is also applicable to nouns, perhaps even

particularly susceptible to non-equivalent repetition. The passage quoted above exemplifies just how this feature can be exploited for stylistic effect, although in this case it is merely a prop for a little light comedy which has its origin in Watson's earlier self-introduction as *Thomas Watson*, identifying him as the namesake of Marlowe's fag.

The third type of non-equivalent repetition includes homonymy to the extent that co-homonyms have identity of form but neither lexical nor referential equivalence. In the case of homophony there is identical pronunciation, hence identity of phonological form, but different spelling. In

> Kit, the very sound of dripping, kit kit kit [p.70]

the name is homophonous with the reiterated onomatopoeic term that imitates the sound of drops of water striking a surface, differing only in the capitalisation of the initial letter. To state that *Kit* and *kit* constitute an instance of homophony rather than homonymy on the strength of how the initial consonant is spelled in each term may seem a case of hair-splitting; but the change of lexicological status change of lexical accompanying shift from the upper to the lower case seems to justify the preference for the former term as the designation for this example of non-equivalent repetition.

Repetition, it will be seen, is a far more complex notion than it would seem to be at first sight. The exact repetition of a lexical item or phrase need not involve referential equivalence, and in the case of core names and homonymy it does not entail lexical equivalence either. More importantly, the complexity of repetition renders phonological repetition amenable to exploitation for stylistic ends as much as phonological parallelism is, although the stylistic exploitation of the formal features of language is traditionally assumed to be more a licence of poetry than prose fiction.

3.1.2. Phonological Parallelism

Since parallelism is the partial repetition of a structure, it follows that the parallel structures should possess at least one element of identity, and at least one element of contrast (Leech 1969: 65). As regards paronomasia, and assuming the general syllabic pattern in English to be that of a consonant or consonant cluster followed by a vowel

---

more so than names in that common noun like *rose* will have far more referents than the personal name *Tom* bearers. Despite its looseness, however, the term will be adopted because, like name density, it is a conveniently economical way of referring to the lop-sidedness of name-bearer relations.

in turn checked by a consonant or consonant cluster, phonological parallelism may present one of the following six patterns:

a) repetition of an initial consonant or consonant cluster, or alliteration, e.g. ***K**ind **K**it*;
b) repetition of a final consonant or consonant cluster, or consonance, e.g. *Ki**t**, sa**t***;
c) repetition of consonant or consonant cluster immediately preceding and immediately following the vowel, or apophony, e.g. ***Ki**t*, ***Ke**tt*;
d) repetition of a stressed vowel, or assonance, e.g. *K**i**t, the very sound of dr**i**pping*;
e) repetition of the vowel-consonant pattern in word-final position, or rhyme, e.g. *K**it**, s**it***;
f) repetition of the consonant-vowel pattern in word-initial position, or pararhyme, e.g. ***Ki**t*, ***Ky**d*.

The classification just given draws mainly on Leech (1969), although slightly altering the terminology he uses. Following Wales (1989: 31) and Bussmann (1996 [1990]: 2), the term apophony is preferred to that of pararhyme[13], while Leech's other coinage, reverse rhyme, has been retained because the term seems to be the recognised one for the repetition of initial consonant and vowel (see Wales 1989: 409).

One aspect to be borne in mind regarding phonological parallelism is the possible effects the different grammatical realisations of the terms can have on the scheme as a whole. The names *Kit* and *Kett* are cited in (c) as an example of apophony, but in "Kett spoke mildly with mild interest, his face thrusting into Kit's" [p.7] the realisation of the familiar name in the possessive case transforms the phonological relation it has with the family name. The addition of the inflection to the former name gives [ts] so that its termination is no longer the same as that of the uninflected one. On the other hand, the onset of the terms is not affected by this alteration, with the result that their relation is transformed from apophony to alliteration. Other phonological schemes are not so

[13] Confusingly, Cuddon (1979: 153) terms the repetition of identical consonants before and after different vowels as consonance. Bussmann (1996 [1990]: 2-3) regards *apophony* as an alternative term to *ablaut*, defined as a morphologised vowel alternation to indicate differences in tense in strong verbs, as in *dr**i**nk, dr**a**nk, drunk.*

sensitive to such changes. For instance, *Kit* and *Christ* alliterate regardless of whether they are in possessive or common case. In any case, as the first example shows, the interpretation of the paronomasia need not be affected by the grammatical realisation of the terms involved.

To conclude this overview of phonological parallelism, mention should made of one terms coined to facilitate the analysis of the formal relations names enter into the text within the framework of the schemes just listed. The coinage in question is that of "eye-alliteration," on the analogy of the already existing expression *eye-rhyme*. Just as eye-rhyme suggests identical word-final pronunciation through identical spelling (Cuddon 1979: 225; Wales 1989: 167-8), eye-alliteration suggests the repetition of the same word-initial consonant sound. An instance of the latter licence is the orthographic bond between *Kit* and *know* based on the deletion of initial /κ/, or aphaeresis (Crystal 1991 [1980]: 21), in the *kn*- cluster to give the impression of genuine phonological alliteration. This expedient enables the inclusion the verb in the analysis, a key word in *A Dead Man in Deptford* which contributes greatly to the definition of Marlowe's character.

3.1.3. Phonological, Lexical and Syntactic Schemes

Up to now phonological schemes have been viewed very much in isolation. However, since phonologically-bound terms occur in both syntactic structures and lexical items, it follows that there must be a large degree of interrelation of phonological with lexical and syntactic patterning. To begin with, phonological and lexical schemes overlap or are co-extensive with one another. Save for the assonance with *dripping*, all the relations involving *Kit* listed in 3.1.2 are as much a lexical as a phonological insomuch as the terms are free-standing items.

In cases in which a phonological scheme coincides with a lexical one, the terms may be subject to patterning through the repetition of the pair in the same clause or sentence. In

> [c]at or Kit I said, and indeed about Kit there was something of the cat [p.4]

the terms *cat* and *Kit* are twice foregrounded: phonologically through the relation of apophony, and lexically through the repetition of each term. These are moreover repeated in reverse order, creating a pattern reminiscent of the rhetorical figure of antistrophe (Wales 1989: 28). The pattern the repeated terms fall into, assisted by the

fronting of the first pair, adds to the prominence accorded to them by virtue of their apophony. It also heightens the prominence of *cat* at the expense of *Kit* by placing it at either extreme of the sentence, marking it out as the more significant member of the pair. The interpretation of the phonological parallelism between *cat* and *Kit* in this case would seem to be conditioned by the syntactic parallelism they form part of.

In tracing the hidden semantic connections between phonologically bound items, attention should not be confined to the formal correspondences and differences between them. As clause elements, or constituents of clause elements, the structure of the syntactic frame the items belong to should also be examined, as it may yield clues which might assist in the interpretation of the underlying ties which bind those items.

3.2. Phonological Schemes and Narrative Motifs

Leech and Short (1981: 50), quoting Mukařovský, maintain that the defining feature of literary language is the "consistent and systematic character of foregrounding." The concept of foregrounding can be defined in various ways, but in the context of phonological bonding the term will be used to refer to the way individual linguistic features stand out from the rest of the text and draw attention to themselves (Wales 1989: 182). The insistence on consistency and systematicity implies two things. First, that to be stylistically relevant foregrounding must be artistically motivated, that is, the salience of an item or structure must not be accidental but by design. Second, that to be stylistically relevant the foregrounded features must recur throughout the text, although taking care that their recurrence is not too frequent so as to prevent the diminishing of their prominence through over-familiarisation. These two conditions are met by the various phonological relations *Kit* enters into with the co-homophones and near-homophones the name co-occurs with, some of them having been exemplified in the instances of phonological parallelism listed in 3.1.2. As it identifies the main character, *Kit* is the most-used name of Burgess's novel, and the high frequency of its token appearances ensures the recurrence of the schemes it forms part of. The different permutations of phonological patterning makes for greater variation of phonological schemes, thereby helping them continue to stand out from the text. On looking more closely at the selection of schemes instanced, one is likely to be struck by the lexicological variety of the terms *Kit* is linked to: *Kett* and *Kyd* are core names, in contrast to *dripping*, *kind*, *sat* and *sit*, which are all items from the common vocabulary. The phonological and orthographical correspondences of the latter with *Kit* may trigger

the semantic contagion (Ross 1992) of the name, that is, the acquisition of the lexical and connotative meanings of the term it is paired with. One of the ends of bonding the familiar form of Marlowe's forename with content words may well be to endow it with the meanings the latter convey as a means of characterising the bearer. Consequently, one of the functions of foregrounding is to alert readers to the possibility of a concealed semantic connection behind the formal one, and to induce them to uncover it. As a foregrounding device, then, paronomasia involving *Kit* performs a dual function: the invitation of interpretation through self-advertisement.

3.2.1. Narrative Motifs Contrasted with Phonological Schemes

As a recurrent feature of the text, the phonological foregrounding of *Kit* may be regarded as one of the motifs of *A Dead Man in Deptford*, the term motif being understood in its broadest sense of a repeated local feature (Sage & Sage 1987 [1973]: 248). More specifically, the periodic occurrence of the phonological schemes with *Kit* is a motif based on the linguistic features of the terms constituting them, as opposed to motifs consisting of the repeated depiction of situations or events at different points of the narrative. For convenience the term phonological scheme will be retained for the repetition of foregrounded linguistic features at different points of the text, to differentiate them from narrative motifs, the term which will from now on be used for the narration of recurring situations or events.

Like phonological schemes a narrative motif can be broken down into its component parts. While schemes are analysable into phonemes, a motif consists roughly of a reference frame, an orientational system that provides a spatial and temporal structure for the narrated scenario (Yuhan and Shapiro 1996: 192), the characters involved in the scenario, and the actions the characters perform or the events that befall them. One of the easily identifiable narrative motifs in Burgess's novel is the tavern brawl: throughout the novel Marlowe is depicted as attending drinking and supper parties and getting into fights on these social occasions. The spatial reference frame for the motif is indicated by its label: a tavern, ordinary, victualling house, or any other establishment licensed to serve food and drink. As regards the analysis of the actions and events of this motif, a particularly useful tool is the concept of semantic frame, which Lehrer and Kittay (1992: 4), drawing on Fillmore (1985: 223) and Fillmore and Atkins (1992: 76), define as an interpretative device which enables speakers to make sense of a term in a given context against "a structured background of experience, beliefs, or practices."

Accordingly the scenario conjured up by the noun *brawl* will include a reference to the antagonists, the cause of the confrontation, the escalation from verbal abuse to physical violence, and bodily harm and damage done. The advantage of this approach, as Goffman (1986 [1972]: 10-1) and Ungerer and Schmid (1996: 206) point out, is that a broad array of apparently disparate scenarios realised through an almost infinite variety of different clause patterns can be accounted for by a single frame.

Unlike schemes, which may involve either free or partial repetition, motifs invariably involve the latter. The predication

Marlowe was involved in a tavern brawl

constitutes the semantic representation of the tavern-brawl frame and is applicable to several episodes from the novel. In each of the episodes the summarising sentence is applied to, the same basic sequence of events and actions may be discerned, namely provocation, angry exchange and outbreak of violence. Nevertheless, the realisation of these events differs from one episode to the other. In one episode Marlowe, the only constant of the tavern-brawl motif, may be the provoked party, but the provoker in another; and in one episode he may be the object of aggression, but the aggressor in another. In addition to this, the brawl may break out in different locales, even though they all answer to the description of tavern, and certainly at different times, and the identity of his opponents may vary as well. The circumstantial detail of the brawl is also likely to be very different: in one fight drunkenness is a factor, in another it is not; weapons are used in one fight, and in another the brawlers use their bare hands; Marlowe wins one fight, but takes a battering in another. Narrative motifs, in the final analysis, are made up of scenarios which parallel but never reduplicate one another.

Finally, as Baldick (1990: 121) points out, narrative motifs often have a supporting role to play with regard to themes, the subject-matter of a literary work (Sage & Sage 1987 [1973]: 248), in that the recurrence of an image, symbol or situation helps the reader in the apprehension of these themes. The predominance of the tavern-brawl motif gives expression to the theme of Marlowe's destiny. At the end of the novel he is murdered at a Deptford victualling house, and his death passed off as an accidental killing in the course of a violent altercation, an explanation which forms the basis of the myth that Christopher Marlowe died in a tavern brawl. The repetition of the tavern-brawl scenario seems to lead up to the dénouement of the novel, contributing to the ever stronger impression that Burgess's Marlowe is a man fated to suffer a violent and

untimely end. As the phonological schemes involving *Kit* are motifs as well, in that they are a recurrent element of the text, these schemes also tap into the thematic concerns of *A Dead Man in Deptford*, and therefore provide a point of ingress to the interpretation of the novel.

3.2.2. Phonological Schemes and Semantic Contagion

In 2.2.5.2 of the previous chapter the bearer is identified as the main source for the connotations picked up by a core personal name. Burgess's Marlowe, for example, may gain an unsavoury reputation as a brawler on account of his propensity for getting into fights so that *Kit* becomes a synonym of *brawler*. The process whereby a name comes to connote a salient attribute of the bearer is termed epitomisation, and is to be distinguished from another process of meaning acquisition mentioned in passing in the introduction to this section, semantic contagion.

Ross (1992: 144) defines semantic contagion as the "meaning-adaption of words to their verbal contexts." To illustrate this concept, the primary acceptation of the verb in "he swallowed his water" is contrasted to the figurative meaning in "he swallowed his rage" (Ross 1992: 145)[14]. In the second sentence the direct object is a noun phrase that refers to a feeling, with the result that the meaning of the *swallow* is changed from 'make food and water go down the throat to the stomach' to 'conceal' or 'repress.' The lexical meaning of *swallow*, then, is not a stable property of the verb, but has to accommodate itself to the meanings of the content words it co-occurs with whenever it is used.

The phonological bonding of core names like *Kit*, with or without the reinforcement of syntactic patterning, make them sensitive to the co-text as well, although in different way to content words like *swallow*. Since core names are items voided of operative semantic content, their semantic contagion involves the transfer of the lexical or connotative meanings of the term they are paired with, and at times reactivating their etymological meanings, their dormant semantic content. As Ross (1992: 147) would put it, core names are semantically captured by the terms they are phonologically bound to. To illustrate semantic contagion in core names, the contrastive pair formed by *Dead* and *Dept-* contained in the title to Burgess's novel will be examined in the next sub-section,

[14] For the sake of clarity of exposition only two of the noun phrases collocating with *swallowed* Ross cites have been selected.

and an interpretation of their underlying semantic relation ventured on the basis of their phonetic correspondences.

3.2.3. The Interpretation of Phonological Schemes Illustrated

If the title *A Dead Man in Deptford* is read aloud, the first thing to catch the attention of the practised ear is the relation of homophony between the adjective and the first syllable as a result of the devoicing of word-final /d̃/ in the former. The prominence given to the two terms by virtue of their phonological bond makes homophony a foregrounding device. By drawing attention to *Dead* and *Dept-*, the homophony suggests that there is a further connection between them at a deeper level, thereby inviting the reader to uncover that connection.

On tracing the semantic relation underlying the repetition of distinctive phonetic features, the first thing to come to light is probably the baleful associations attached to *Deptford* because it names the scene of Marlowe's violent end, already alluded to by *Dead*. The homophonous relation of the adjective with *Dept-* encourages the transfer of the descriptive content of the adjective to the stem, converting the place name as a byword for the protagonist's death. In highlighting the stem, moreover, a second homophonous relation is educed, this time with a word absent from the co-text, *debt*. Like *Dead* the covert co-homophone imbues *Deptford* with connotations of Marlowe's demise. The coroner's inquisition into his death[15], reproduced at the end of the novel by way of a coda to the account given by the Narrator, establishes he was accidently killed in a quarrel arising from a disagreement over who should pay for the repast Marlowe and his companions had taken. In the coroner's words:

> [A]fter supper the said Ingram & Christopher Morley were in speech & uttered one to the other divers malicious words for the reason that they could not be at one nor agree about the payment of pence, that is, *le reckynge*, there.

If the title suggests a concern with the events leading up to Marlowe's killing in a Deptford victualling house, the phonological similarities borne by two of its elements allude to its alleged cause.

The eduction of *debt* through its homophony with *Dept-* relates it to *Dead*. Being a co-homophone of the stem, the elicited noun is also phonologically bound to the

[15] It should be noted that what is written into *A Dead Man in Deptford* is not from the inquest findings proper, which were drafted in legal Latin, but from Leslie Hotson's translation given in his monograph on Marlowe's death (1925: 31-4). Whatever quotes are made from the inquisition will, unless stated otherwise, be from this source.

adjective. Through this connection the expressive content of *Dead* conditions the reading of *le reckynge*, or *reckoning*, the term from the inquest findings alluded to by *debt*. As the extract above makes clear, the reckoning is the total amount owed for services rendered: hence the relevance of *debt*. However, *reckoning* can also signify the action of calculating the amount by adding up the subtotals prior to the settling of accounts, or payment of what is owed. Both meanings of the word are relevant to the frame-metaphor whereby the exacting of revenge is expressed in terms of settling a debt. Accordingly *reckoning* and *settling of accounts* both mean the avenging of past misdeeds as well as the discharging of incurred debts. The retaliatory meaning of *reckoning* is triggered by the relation it has with *Dead* through the mediation of the phonological bond of the adjective with *Dept-* and subsequently with *debt*.

What merits notice about the interpretation just given of the homophonous relations of *Dept-*, *Dead* and *debt* is the role of semantic contagion. To begin with, it relates paronomasia to what Leech (1981 [1974]: 16) calls reflected meaning, described as a side effect of polysemy whereby one meaning of a word intrudes on the meaning with which that word is used. As seen above, *reckoning* is susceptible to semantic interference of this sort. By virtue of its dominant suggestive power, the figurative meaning 'punishment for past offences' impinges on the literal one of 'estimate' or 'action of estimating.' On the other hand, it is equally important to stress the role played by the formal similarities borne by different expressions involved in bringing semantic contagion into play. It is the re-motivation of *Dept-* as *debt* by virtue of their homophony that enables the eduction of *reckoning*, and the presence of *Dead* that brings the figurative meaning of *reckoning* to the fore on account of its loaded descriptive content. Relations based on phonological correspondences between co-occurring items can trigger semantic contagion as much as polysemy does. Neither the connection of *Dept-* with *debt* nor the subsequent eduction of *reckoning* would have been made if it were not for the presence of *Dead* to highlight the acoustic form of the stem through homophony.

On this account, then, semantic contagion may be regarded as a manifestation of paronomasia, since it trades on both polysemy and formal similarity for its effect (Leech 1969: 209). Its defining feature is the relevance that the multiple meanings paronomasia brings into play have for the context in which the word bearing them is used. Returning to the example under discussion, both the figurative and literal meanings of *reckoning* are germane to the narrative introduced by the title, though

each in a different way. Whereas the literal meaning refers to the ostensible cause of Marlowe's death, the figurative meaning suggests an ulterior one. Again, the role played by the phonological schemes contained in the title must be stressed. Not only do they lead one to *reckoning*, it also signals the greater relevance of its figurative meaning for the reading of the novel.

Summing up, the homophony in the title refers indirectly to the theme of revenge. First, *Dead* enables the metanalysis of *Dept-* as *debt* through phonological foregrounding, then *debt* evokes *reckoning* through synonymy, and finally the meaning of repayment conveyed by *reckoning* is supplanted by that of taking revenge through the deferred modification of *reckoning* by *Dead*. This rather tortuous reference to a revenge killing is framed by the knowledge that Deptford is the scene of Marlowe's death on the one hand, and the circumstances of the killing are rehearsed in the coroner's inquisition on the other. The chain of associations occasioned by the phonological pairing of *Dead* with *Dept-* imbues the title with a sinister subtext which primes the informed reader for the narrative that ensues. At one level, *A Dead Man in Deptford* suggests an attempt to provide the dead man with an identity through the depiction of his life and career. At another, it challenges the received version of his death, insinuating unconscionable motives for wanting him dead that will emerge from the narrative.

3.3. The Functions Performed by Phonological Schemes

From the account of phonological schemes given in the preceding two sections one may deduce that these figures carry out three functions. First and foremost they are foregrounding devices: they attract the reader's attraction with a view to eliciting some sort of response. Given their recurrence throughout the novel, phonological schemes are to be regarded as motifs, and as such act as cohesive ties. Finally, since at least one of the highlighted terms is a personal name, and since phonological pairing triggers semantic contagion, paronomasia is a means of characterising the bearer of the name. Characterisation, cohesion and foregrounding, therefore, are the three functions performed by phonological schemes containing core personal names.

3.3.1. Foregrounding: A Justification

As regards phonological schemes as foregrounding devices, nothing else needs to be said about this function except to insist that their prominence is aesthetically motivated.

Because deciding what is and what is not foregrounded is itself a matter of subjective interpretation (Leech 1987 [1973]: 98), there is a danger of reading meanings into features which have no aesthetic motivation. This caveat against the pitfalls our subjectivity may prepare for us is especially apposite as regards personal names, the main focus of this thesis. The characters of a novel must have names, and the characters of *A Dead Man in Deptford* are all, with the exception of one or two supernumeraries, based on biographical personages so that the real-life author has not even had to invent their names. It is taken as read that Christopher Marlowe was called Kit Marlowe by his acquaintances, and that at the beginning of his residence at Corpus Christi one of the fellows there was Francis Kett, whom he may or may not have met. Accordingly, if they are depicted in the same passage together, the apophony between *Kit* and *Kett*, though noticeable, is coincidental because their occurrence is dictated by the necessity of distinguishing the one character from the other. In the sentence quoted in 3.1.3, however, the apophony of *Kit* and *cat* is not only repeated, the two token appearances of each term are so placed as to form the rhetorical syntactic frame for antistrophe, which suggests design, as the pattern has the effect of enhancing the phonological bond of the two terms. There is evidence of similar patterning in other sentences where the names co-occur, fostering the suspicion that the enhancing of their apophony is deliberate, a suspicion in turn borne out by the abundance of lexical patterning based on phonological similarities involving other names. There seems to be sufficient textual evidence to support the view that the phonological prominence of personal names in Burgess's novel displays the consistency Mukařovský accords to artistically motivated foregrounding.

3.3.2. Phonological Schemes as Cohesive Ties

In the long run the systematic exploitation of the phonological correspondences of paired items is effected by a species of law of diminishing returns. At first schemes catch the reader's attention, but with repetition their novelty wears off so that they lose the expressive force they originally had unless the terms constituting them are highlighted through additional means such as syntactic patterning. The recurrent use of the same schemes, in other words, deprives them of their foregrounding function. They are resorted to so often that they are no longer conspicuous, with the result that the over-frequency of phonological, lexical and syntactic patterns becomes the norm.

The loss of prominence brought about by the overuse of schemes is offset by their contribution to the cohesion of the narrative. Indeed, repetition, the principle behind schemes, is recognised as one of the most basic devices employed to lend consistency to text (Wales 1989: 74). This would suggest phonological schemes function as cohesive ties as well as foregrounding devices. Initially, they draw attention to the terms which make up the scheme, and then to the underlying semantic relations between those terms. Once these relations are established, the schemes expressing them serve as cohesive ties which link the passages they appear in to one another. Yet even when they perform this function, phonological schemes still retain their initial foregrounding role in that they help to draw attention to the parallels that may exist between the passages they connect. In other words, phonological schemes identify the passages they occur in as enactments of the same narrative motif.

The relation of phonological schemes, which are essentially formal motifs, with narrative motifs is thrown into relief by the analysis of the homophony in the title of the novel carried out in 3.2.3. The interplay of semantic connections brought out by the examination of *Dead* and *Dept-* conjure up the circumstances of Marlowe's violent death, with the insinuation that he has been the victim of a revenge killing. The scene of the killing, a Deptford victualling house later misnamed a tavern (Nicholl 1992: 35), also introduces the tavern-brawl motif, arguably the narrative backbone to the novel. The successive re-enactments of the tavern-brawl scenario have the effect of directing the narrative to its climax, the killing which inspires the title. The interrelation between narrative motif and phonological scheme sets up a tension between conflicting images of the protagonist. The figure of the trouble-maker suggested by Marlowe's continual implication in tavern brawls contrasts sharply to that of the victim implied in the title. Reconciling these opposites is perhaps the central concern of *A Dead Man in Deptford* which both narrative motifs and phonological schemes help to develop.

3.3.3. Phonological Schemes as an Aid to Characterisation

As argued in 3.2.2, one of the corollaries of pairing items on the basis of their phonological similarities is the semantic contagion of term by the other, which in turn presupposes the dominance of the term that semantically captures its partner (Ross 1992: 157). In phonological relations in which one term is a core name and the other a content word, such as the apophony of *Kit* with *cat*, the dominant term is invariably the latter. The meaning transferred from the dominant to the dominated term assists in the

characterisation of the character bearing the semantically contaminated name. In the example just instanced, *cat* endues *Kit* with feline associations that define the bearer's character as feline. As they do not have lexical meaning, names are particularly susceptible to being folk-etymologised (Clark 1992: 542), and semantic contagion acts as a catalyst for folk-etymology for the purposes of characterisation.

Since the bulk of the terms used in phonological schemes are core personal names, as in the quasi-homophonous relation between *Kit* and *Kyd*, there are schemes whose terms are both names. Such schemes seemingly pose the problem of deciding which of the two terms the dominant one is, as neither of them is endowed with semantic content. However, at least one of names will have been contaminated, in principle allowing it to transfer its acquired meaning to its uncontaminated pattern, and therefore marking it out as the dominant term. In the example given, *Kit* may be regarded as the dominant term on account of the feline associations acquired from its apophony with *cat*, or alternatively *Kyd* may be considered as the dominant term because of the caprine associations picked up from its homophony with *kid*. Which of the terms is the dominant one depends on the relevance of the associations each brings to the co-text in which they co-occur. In any case their phonological similarities and dissimilarities reflect and underscore affinities and differences between their bearers revealed through their respective depictions.

Finally, it is convenient to point out that an item may appear as a term in more than one scheme. For instance, *Kit* is phonologically bound not only to *cat* by aphonony but to *Kett* as well, not mention the alliterative relation it has with *Christ* or the homophony with *Kyd*. The multilateral relations the familiar name enters into makes for the amplification of the characterisation of its bearer. Conversely, it allows the transfer of attributes from one term to another, even though they never co-occur in the same passage. *Cat* and *Kyd*, for example, never co-occur, but thanks to their respective phonological bonds with *Kit*, with which they co-occur in different passages, it is possible to establish a connection between the two terms mentioned.

3.4. Recapitulation

The illustrations of paronomasia given over the preceding sections corroborate and extend the conclusion drawn at the end of the previous chapter. The theoretical separation of the acoustic form of the linguistic expression from its semantic content on the one hand, and of the linguistic expression from its referent on the other, is not

possible in practice. To account for the effects produced by the ordering of the phonemes into schemes is to assign a meaning to them. The assignment of meaning involves drawing partly on the lexical meanings of the patterned terms, and partly on the background knowledge the reader brings to the text. Accordingly, the lexical meanings of *Dead* and *debt*, in conjunction with the associations called forth by *Deptford*, are enlisted to identify the unnamed man of the title as Christopher Marlowe, and to fuel speculations about his death. The recourse to both pragmatic and lexical meaning is what enables the relation of *Dead* with *Dept-* and *debt*, and of *Dept-* with *debt*, to invest the title *A Dead Man in Deptford* with a subtext of foul play.

The example of phonological foregrounding in the title of Burgess's novel also gives the lie to the contention that proper names do not form contrastive relationships as other linguistic expressions do (see 2.2.2). The homophony between *Dead* and *Dept-* is an instantiation of the principle of opposition, or meaningful contrast, at the phonological level of analysis. The one member of the contrastive pair is an adjective, and therefore a lexical item; the other the stem of a place name, and as a result an expression which reputedly does not quite belong to language system. Nevertheless, if the items are transcribed phonemically, it becomes patent their homophonous relation is identical to that of *Dead* with *debt*. Detached from its onomastic suffix, non-lexical *Dept-* is as susceptible of becoming a member of a minimal pair as its lexical co-homophones are. Bearing in mind that the stem is part of a place name, the comparison of the two minimal pairs confirms Gardiner's contention, alluded to in the introduction to this chapter, that "[m]aterially a 'word' and a 'name' are identical" (1954: 7).

Having established their material identity with lexical items, it may be argued that proper names can set up relational systems on the basis of their phonological features as other linguistic expressions do. To be significant, however, a phonological relation should determine meaning (Burgess 1975 [1964]: 126). In the minimal pair formed by *dead* and *debt*, for instance, the /d/-/t/ opposition serves to identify the second term as meaning 'what is owed', and the former 'not alive.' The same principle holds in the contrastive relation of *cat* with *Kit*, but in a more limited way than in the previous pair. The /æ/-/i/ opposition identifies what kind of linguistic unit each member of the pair is, and in the case of *cat* its lexical meaning. In the case of *Kit* and *Kett*, the significance of the /i/-/e/ opposition even more limited. It serves only to distinguish them as separate personal names, and as separate subtypes of personal name: a familiar name and a

family name. As far as names are concerned, it seems, the principle of opposition is confined to phonological contrasts.

Viewed collectively, the repetition of sound patterns places names within a network of relations analogous to that formed by a lexical or semantic field. That is, the terms included in this network, be they names or content words, are to be understood as a set of items applied to a thematic domain of *A Dead Man in Deptford*. This domain is identified in the title, namely the dead man in Deptford, referred to throughout the novel as *Kit*, the name that enters into the largest number of phonological relations. Semantically, the relations among the terms which configure the network are excitatory on account of the transfer of meanings from one term to another. The prevalence of semantic contagion within this field structure enables the organisation of the thematic domain into relations of affinity and contrast, reflecting the relationships among the characters and mutually defining them in terms of common and distinguishing features realised through the distinctive phonetic features borne by their names.

In addition to characterising their bearers, the ordering of names into patterns contributes to text coherence by creating ties between the passages in which these patterns occur. As cohesive devices, moreover, phonological schemes establish parallels between passages in different parts of the narrative in the manner of anaphoric and cataphoric reference. Thanks to their recurrence in different parts of the narrative, together with the associations they acquire, phonological schemes both anticipate events to be related at a later point of the Narrator's chronicle and refer back to events already related at an earlier point, creating a sensation of tragic foreboding intimated by the phonological foregrounding in the title of the novel.

4. Metaphorical Framing through the *Kit-Cat* Apophony

As stated in the preceding chapter, *Kit* is not only the name Marlowe is habitually called by throughout the narrative: it is also the name given special prominence on account of the phonological bonds linking it to some of the lexical items it co-occurs with, whether names or items belonging to other word classes. Indeed, on looking over the text, however superficially, one is struck by the overuse of the familiar form of the protagonist's forename, explicable in terms of the stylistic aims Burgess has set himself. In many passages *Kit* is used even though its bearer's identity is sufficiently established for him to be referred to by personal pronoun, largely in order that the name can be paired off with a term it is phonologically bound to. As also indicated in the preceding chapter, the foregrounding of *Kit* is motivated by the thematic concerns of *A Dead Man in Deptford*, which can be summed up as an attempt to discover Marlowe's identity through the Cratylean conception of the name as a key to the bearer's self. The centrality thus conferred on the familiar shortening of *Christopher* means the remaining chapters of the first part of this thesis will be mainly devoted to the analysis of the phonological relations the name enters into, with a view to ascertaining these relations significance hold for the interpretation of Burgess's fictional life of Christopher Marlowe. As regards the present chapter, five instances of foregrounding occurring in the early part of the novel will be examined with the aim of providing a point of departure for the interpretation of patterning undergone by *Kit*, which will be developed in the subsequent three chapters. Before proceeding to the analysis, however, it should be noted that Marlowe is addressed and referred to by other names as well. In view of this it is perhaps convenient to start by offering a short account of the naming practices followed in the novel for the primary identification of its main character so as to provide a background against which the examination proposed is carried out.

4.1. A Preliminary Outline of Naming Practices for Marlowe

The naming of Marlowe in *A Dead Man in Deptford* is neatly summed up in the following exchange with Thomas Walsingham, Marlowe's future lover and patron, which takes place on the two characters making each other's acquaintance:

> Who are you, by the way?
>
> —Marlowe or Marley or Morley. You have a choice. The first name does not equivocate. Christopher.
>
> —Which is Kit, so you are Kit, come, Kit, Kit, Kit. A university youngster on the make, and why not. You have spying ambitions [p.32]?

From the self-introduction two distinguishing features immediately emerge which define the naming convention followed in the novel. The first, and the more obtrusive, is the variety of forms exhibited by his family name, a peculiarity which has become a commonplace in Marlowe studies to judge by the attention it has attracted among students of the dramatist's work and biographers (Hotson 1925: 57; Boas 1940: 1; Bakeless 1942: 7; Steane 1965: 11; Salgãdo 1971: 118; Williamson 1972: 254; Nicholl 1992: 339-40; Marcus 1996: 38; Downie 2000: 19; Farey 2006). The offhand manner in which Marlowe reels off the different byforms of his name suggests a relation of free variation: one variant may be substituted for another with no consequent change of identity. Alternatively, following Derrida, the existence of so many variants of *Marlowe* constitutes an extreme instance of iterability, the changes in material form a word undergoes every time it is used in an utterance (Schalkwyk 2000: 172). The second feature is the avoidance of the forename in favour of the familiar name derived from *Christopher*. On learning Marlowe's forename, Walsingham's immediate reaction is to rename his new acquaintance *Kit*. In other words, an initial act of didactic naming, Marlowe's self-introduction, instantly prompts an act of secondary performative naming, Walsingham's substitution of *Kit* for *Christopher* and the subsequent use of the familiar name every time he addresses or refers to Marlowe (see 2.1.2 for didactic and performative naming).

Walsingham is not alone in his preference for the pet name. On his first assignment as an agent in the employ of Sir Francis Walsingham, Walsingham's cousin, Marlowe infiltrates a band of exiled Catholics plotting the overthrow of Queen Elizabeth. On inviting him to join the group, the ringleader, Father John Ballard, asks Marlowe his name, resulting in the same rigmarole which characterises his self-introduction to Walsingham. First, Marlowe gives his family name, or rather some of the variants it is rendered into,

> I am Marlowe or Morley or Marley [p.58],

followed, at Ballard's request, by his forename,

> And you are what?
> —Christopher [p.59],

and finally, as the priest warms to him, the forename is discarded in favour of its familiar form

> Could Christopher, whom he would call Kit with his permission, add aught, he had the look of a poet [p.60].

When Marlowe is sent for to be briefed for his next mission on the Continent, the pattern his self-introduction conforms to is so established that mentioning a part of that pattern is sufficient to recall the whole[16]. In the narrative report of the conversation held on the journey from Cambridge to London, Nicholas Faunt, a courier from Francis Walsingham who has come to fetch Marlowe, feels on sufficiently intimate terms with his charge to start addressing him by his familiar name:

> Well, if the time should come when Sir Walter's strange doings with mathematicians and atheists had needs be probed by the Service, then Kit, might he call him Kit, had his *entrée* [p.69].

As they have only recently met, and in the light of the previous two introductions, Faunt's familiarity presupposes an earlier and more formal introduction in which Marlowe's family name and forename are given. What the passages just reviewed have in common is that they all express a preference for *Kit* through the commission of an act of renaming in sympathy with a prior self-introduction. Also, due to its repetition, the introduction-renaming pattern just described is another motif involving Marlowe's name, though occurring with less frequency than the repetition of phonological schemes involving *Kit*.

The co-occurrence of the variants of *Marlowe* creates an impression of phonological patterning, largely because of the instability exhibited by the vowel sounds. At first sight this would be grounds for including the family name in the analysis of phonological schemes alongside *Kit*, especially in view of the fact that the variations undergone by *Marlowe* also constitute a recurrent formal motif. Nevertheless, as the phonological patterning involving the family name affects different forms of the same name, reflecting the vagaries of early Modern English pronunciation and spelling, the significance these phonological relations might have is different to those entered into by the familiar name. Unlike *Marlowe*, *Kit* is phonologically linked to other lexical items, a circumstance conducive to semantic contagion, and the acquisition of lexical and

[16] There is one exception to this. When Marlowe introduces himself to his future mentor, the poet-spy Thomas Watson, the pattern is reversed:

> Thomas Watsonus I.V. studious. And you?
> —Christopher. The other name is unsure. Marlin, Merlin, Marley, Morley. Marlowe will do [p.9].

Moreover, unlike Walsingham, Ballard and Faunt, Watson does not fall to calling Marlowe by his pet name until far later into the novel. Another point worth mentioning is that Marlowe shows a slight preference for *Marlowe* over the other variants of his family name.

connotative meaning by the familiar name from the various items it is connected to. Consequently, by investing the name with meanings it otherwise would not have, the phonological patterns *Kit* forms part of helps, among other things, to establish Marlowe's identity. By contrast, the alternative renderings of *Marlowe* would seem to hinder establishment of identity in that they give rise to the impression that they are different names, making their bearer, in Downie's words (2000: 19), "the man with many names." The confusion over whether *Marley*, *Marlin*, *Merlin* and *Morley* are variants of *Marlowe* or different names altogether is relevant to the issue of the identity of the character they are applied to, but lies outside the scope of the analysis of personal names at this stage[17]. For this reason the relevance of the variant spellings and pronunciations of the name will be deferred to Part Two, whereas Part One will centre on *Kit* and the significance it acquires by virtue of the phonological relations it enters into with other items. The present concern with the pet name at the expense of the family name is nicely summed up by the insouciant excuse given by Thomas Walsingham for calling Marlowe *Kit*, another instance of the recurring introduction-renaming motif that figures so conspicuously in the first part of the novel:

> —Come then, Kit Kit Kit, you see I have remembered the name. My grave cousin was mumbling of Morley and Marley and Merlin, but Tom Watson said Kit was enough [p.48].

The comment that "Kit was enough" also suggests the replacement of *Kit* with *Christopher* is motivated by the perception that the familiar name is a more appropriate means of identifying Marlowe than the forename. Like the variation undergone by *Marlowe*, the avoidance of *Christopher* seems to be bound up with the question of the bearer's true identity, and will as a result not be dealt with until Part Two.

To complete this overview of the naming practices applied to Marlowe in *A Dead Man in Deptford*, one more extract from the novel will be brought under brief consideration, which is

> Ballard or Fortescue remembered faintly the Rheims meeting. Christopher, a noble name cattified to Kit [p.81].

[17] The same appears to hold for *Kit* and *Christopher*. Despite their pronounced formal dissimilarity, the former is derived from the latter through clipping and subsequent simplification of the final consonant cluster. On the other hand, the pet name differs from the forename in the degree of social distance it conveys, whereas the variants of the family name are all equal in terms of their social distance. Although a key aspect in the study of naming conventions, social distance goes beyond the remit of the present chapter and will therefore be dealt with in Part Two.

What merits comment here is the enacting of the derivation of *Kit* from *Christopher* in the second sentence of the fragment. Central to this enactment of a lexical operation is the nonce form *cattified*, created by adding the causative suffix *-fy* to *cat* to indicate a process of transformation. The neologism accordingly adds a semantic component to the process of derivation: *Kit* not only identifies its bearer but also characterises him by attributing feline qualities to him. The correspondence between the felinity conveyed by the pet name and the felinity perceived in its bearer may account for the preference for the pet name prompted by Marlowe's disclosure of his forename. *Kit* is preferred to *Christopher* because it is felt to reveal his feline nature, and therefore a more appropriate term of address.

4.2. The Apophony of *Kit* with *Cat*

As stated in the Introduction, the analysis will focus on five instances of phonological foregrounding, namely the apophony between *Kit* and *cat* in

1. So let it be with my cat or Kit [p.3]
2. Cat or Kit I said, and indeed about Kit there was something of the cat [p.4]
3. Well, Cat, Kit I would say, you are no dog [p.35]

and the homophony between *kitticat* and *Kitticat*, reduplicative compounds in which the above phonological relation is realised within the bounds of a single word, in

4. It is a kind of courage but as much may be said of the kitticat cast into the tub for drowning that swims and swims [p.28]
5. Kitticat, Meg said, the Reverend Kitticat, mender of men's souls [p.39].

Two reasons may be advanced to explain why the point of departure for the analysis should be the phonological relation of the protagonist's name with the same noun. First, the relation is the first instance of the phonological bonding of the familiar name to occur in the novel. Second, and more importantly, it is probably the most pervasive of the phonological schemes in that it recurs throughout Parts One and Two of *A Dead Man in Deptford*. The prominence its repetition accords to the co-occurrence of *Kit* with *cat* is reinforced by the nonce form *cattified*, mentioned in the preceding section, which strongly suggests that the pairing of the name with the noun is a means of identifying the bearer with a cat so that this animal acts as a controlling metaphor that stands for Marlowe.

4.2.1. Apophony as a Foregrounding Device

In excerpts [1] and [2] the primary function of apophony is to give emphasis to their respective focal positions. In both constructions slightly more prominence is given to one of the paired terms, although a different one in each case. Whereas in [1] additional salience is given to *Kit*, in [2] it is accorded to *cat*. Since the one term is a name and the other a noun, the shift of emphasis suggests different functions for each instance of apophony. The first instance identifies the dead man mentioned in the title by naming him, the second characterises him by investing his name with feline associations.

The extra prominence is in each case due to the position of the highlighted term within the phonological scheme. In [1] *Kit* is in sentence-final position, the position normally reserved for new information. In [2] *cat* occupies both sentence-initial and final position, which assigns the term the contradictory functions of conveying new as well as given information. What warrants comment in the latter case is its more elaborate syntactic patterning. The greater elaboration of [2] is achieved through the repetition of the apophony and the transposition of its terms to create the rhetorical figure of antistrophe, the repetition of words in reverse order (Leech 1969: 82; Wales 1989: 28). Here the pattern is the result of fronting the conjoin[18] *Cat or Kit*, the direct object of *said*, in the first clause of the sentence, and the prepositional phrase *about Kit* in the second so that *cat* is placed at the beginning and end of [2]. Further, the second instance of apophony is attenuated by the greater distance separating its constituent terms, which assists in the enhancement of *cat* at the expense of *Kit*. The result of this combination of phonological bonding and syntactic patterning is to provide [2] with two foci: one at the beginning and the other at the end of the sentence.

In underlining the information focus of each construction, the phonological scheme reveals the underlying grammatical relations linking its constituent terms. In the conjoin ending [1], apophony helps to define the co-reference of the conjuncts through the disambiguation of the co-ordinator linking them, favouring an inclusive rather than exclusive reading of *or*. Instead of presenting them as mutually excluding alternatives, the co-ordinator establishes a relation of equivalence between *cat* and *Kit*. More concretely, the underlying relation is one of appellation, as the second conjunct is the name by which the referent of the first is to be called throughout the narrative (Quirk et

[18] Here *conjoin* will be used with the meaning it has in generative grammar, namely "a construction where two or more sentences, phrases or words are co-ordinated" (Crystal 1991 [1980]: 73). By the same token, the term *conjunct* will be adopted to refer to the conjoined elements.

al. 1985: 1309)[19]. The disambiguation of *or* effectuated by the apophony between *cat* and *Kit* reveals the conjoin to be an instance of didactic naming: that is, the act of apprising the reader of an established naming convention. According to this reading, the underlying relation between the conjuncts is analogous to that between the subject and its complement in an equational sentence so that, disengaged from the sentence it forms part of, the conjoin might be rendered as *My cat is Kit*. The conjoin not only makes reference to the main character of *A Dead Man in Deptford* but introduces him to the reader as well.

The interpretation of the conjoin as an introduction suggests that the conjuncts do not have the same informational value, even though they are both part of the focus of [1]. By virtue of their phonetic correspondences *cat* and *Kit* are given prominence, and as conjuncts of *or* they have identical syntactic status. As a name applied to the referent of the first conjunct, however, *Kit* is more specific on account of the self-determining nature of core names: hence its postponement to absolute end position. Within the information focus, an increase in informational value may be expressed by an increase in definiteness. The first conjunct specifies its referent by means of the possessive determiner that limits it, and the co-referential second conjunct identifies him through the disclosure of his name. Central to the resultory effect discernible in the conjoin is the relation of apophony that binds the conjuncts. The repetition of consonant sounds assists in the creation of this climactic effect by both plotting and underscoring the augmentation of informational value of the conjoin as the reader passes from the first conjunct to the second.

In [2] the underlying relation is not so much co-reference as hyponymy. To begin with, the first focus of information of the sentence, resulting from the fronting of *Cat or Kit*, is a partial repetition of the conjoin from [1], a result of the dropping of the possessive determiner *my*. One consequence of jettisoning the determiner is to give further prominence to *Cat* on the grounds that the absence of determination here does not conform to the principle that a singular count noun should always be limited by an

[19] In the source consulted the terms *equivalence* and *appellation* are applied to the units of an appositional relationship, not to the members of disjunctive co-ordination. However, because apposition implies identity of reference as well as common grammatical level (Crystal 1991 [1980]: 22), these terms have been re-applied to the conjoined noun phrases on the strength of their co-reference. In their review of the uses of *or*, Quirk *et al*. (1985: 932-4) limit themselves mainly to its function as a logical operator, which fails to account fully for the reading of the underlying relationship between *my cat* and *Kit* given above. Neither does their interpretation of the second conjunct as a restatement of the first obtain in the example under discussion: *Kit* is not a corrective for *my cat*, but identifies the referent of the noun phrase by giving him a name.

explicit determiner. Chalker (1984: 29-30) terms singular count nouns used in this way "unmarked nouns," defining this usage as an instance of conversion whereby a count noun is transformed into a mass noun[20]. As an unmarked noun *Cat* is used in a radically generic sense to denote the whole class of cats rather than an individual specimen. On this account the dropping of the possessive signals a shift from specific to generic reference. Whereas the referent of *my cat*, as well as that of *Kit*, is Marlowe, the referent of *Cat* seems to be the totality of entities that can be classed as cats.

This reading appears to be borne out by about the apophony the simplified conjoin it is balanced against. In its second occurrence *cat* is limited by the definite article, but the indefinite pronoun *something* divests the determiner of specific meaning and invests it with generic meaning. As with *Cat*, the referent of *the cat* is not an individual specimen of cat, but the archetype abstracted from all the specimens belonging to this class of animal. From the generic meaning posited in the noun one may deduce that the effect of the double apophony in [2] is to include Marlowe under the class of cats. To some extent the identification of Marlowe with cats already begins in [1] in that the first reference made to him is as the Narrator's own "cat." In this light [2] may be read as a justification for the appellation, a justification amplified in the description of Marlowe's physical appearance given in the paragraph introduced by the sentence, and initiating his feline characterisation by likening him to a cat.

4.2.2. Apophony as an Aid to Characterisation

Each of the two instances of phonological foregrounding just reviewed assists in the identification of the dead man mentioned in the title of the novel. The weighting of one of the terms observed within each instance indicates alternative forms of identification: through naming in [1], and through assignation to a class of entities in [2]. In the latter case the additional emphasis placed on *cat* may be construed as an incipient characterisation of the individual previously named *Kit*. The phonological correspondences between the noun and the name aids the transfer of feline associations from the one to the other encouraged by the Narrator's likening of Marlowe to a cat.

[20] Here *unmarked* presumably means 'not showing number,' although Chalker is not very clear on this score. Count nouns regularly show plural number through the *-s* inflection, and singular number through the absence of an inflection but always preceded by a determiner. For generic reference the determiner is invariably the indefinite article, as opposed to the zero article in the generic plural: hence the opposition between *a cat* and *cats*. On this account, number is irrelevant in *Cat*: hence the absence of indicators of either plural or singular number.

Although construed as a reinforcement of didactic naming, the apophony in [1] also acts as a trigger for the characterisation of Marlowe initiated in [2]. In the former instance the proximity of *cat* to *Kit* facilitates the eduction of the non-onomastic co-homophone of the name through the combined effect of its formal similarity to the noun and the lexical meaning of the latter. As well as the familiar form of *Christopher*, *Kit* can be read as *kit*, the homophonous informal term for a cat obtained from the apocope of *kitten* (OED 1989: 466 VIII). The semantic contagion undergone by *Kit* enforces the re-reading of *Cat* in the conjoin that opens [2]. In 4.2.1 it is suggested that it is an unmarked noun with generic meaning. Yet just as *kit* is an alternative for *cat*, *Cat* may also be regarded as an alternative name to *Kit* occasioned by the feline connotations received from its non-onomastic co-homophone. As well as an end-clipping of *Catherine*, *Cat* is sometimes used as a nickname for anyone perceived as having a tempestuous character (Pickering 2004 [1999]: 52), which lends credence to the second reading of the term as a name. If this interpretation is accepted, sentence-initial *Cat* and *Kit* occur as citation forms of personal names so that the conjoin they form part of presents two alternative namings of Marlowe, each one suggesting a different facet of felinity.

Admittedly, the lexicological status of *Cat* is obscured on account of its sentence-initial position. Any word occupying this position invariably begins with the upper case regardless of the word class it belongs to, with the result that there is no way of ascertaining whether the term is a name or a noun. Yet on reading the portrait painted of Marlowe in the paragraph introduced by [2], one finds there textual evidence to support, if not confirm, the onomastic reading of *Cat*. In the following sentence Marlowe is not only said to have "green eyes," the colour of cat's eyes, but also to be in the habit of blinking them and avoiding eye contact "as cats will." Three sentences farther his face is described as being "feline" and having "whiskers" rather than a "true mustachio." The cumulative effect of the description given of Marlowe is to confirm his identification with cats established in [2] and intimated by the marked phonetic similarity of *Kit* to *cat*, at least as regards his physical appearance. The general thrust of the paragraph containing [2] tends to resolve the ambiguity surrounding *Cat* in favour of the onomastic reading of the term.

The strongest argument for the onomastic reading is found in the slip of the tongue depicted in [3]. Here there is no doubt as to the onomastic status of *Cat*, although as a name it is misapplied, because its initial letter is in the upper case, even though the word

is not in sentence-initial position on account of the discourse marker. The lapse may therefore be regarded as confirmation of the acquired felinity of *Kit*. The use of *Cat* as a term of address instead of *Kit* evinces a perceived equivalence of the two items, an equivalence expressed negatively through the excuse offered for the mistake: "you are no dog." The correction following immediately after the confusion with Marlowe's name emphasises the equivalence between *cat* and *Kit*.

On comparing Walsingham's utterance with the conjoins in [1] and [2], it becomes apparent that the mistaken and correct terms of address are part of a process of simplification. In passing from *my cat or Kit* to *Cat or Kit*, the first conjoin is simplified by dropping the possessive; and in passing from the latter conjoin to *Cat, Kit I would say*, the co-ordinator disappears so that the noun and name would be contiguous if it were not for the comma. The juxtaposition of the two terms represents the semantic re-motivation of *Kit*: its physical contiguity with *cat* becomes the outward sign of their semantic equivalence in the narrative.

The feline characterisation of Marlowe traced through the three extracts reviewed is rounded off by Meg Marlowe's mocking reference to her brother as *the Reverend Kitticat* in [4]. While *Kit* and *cat* have hitherto co-occurred as discrete though mainly co-referential terms, here they co-occur as constituents of a new linguistic expression, *Kitticat*. Their composition into a single word marks the completion of the double process observed from [1] to [3]. At the morphological level the transition is from separation to contiguity, and from there to union through amalgamation. The gradual combination of *Kit* and *cat* runs parallel with an increased perception of the equivalence of the two terms. As conjuncts separated by the co-ordinator their semantic equivalence is suggested by their phonological correspondences, as contiguous terms this equivalence becomes more pronounced, and as base forms of *Kitticat* their equivalence is finally lexicalised. The compound is the lexical embodiment of the identification of Marlowe as a cat.

Pragmatically, the transformation of *Christopher* into *Kit* is the substitution of an appropriate name for a inappropriate one. This is nicely illustrated, as seen in 4.1, by Walsingham's renaming Marlowe by his pet name immediately after being apprised of his forename on making his acquaintance. The pronoun in "[w]hich is Kit" refers back to *Christopher*, enabling the relative clause to be recast as an equational sentence which establishes a relation of identity between the forename and the familiar name. The following clause, "so you are Kit," is also equational, although this time the equivalence

is established between the familiar name and its bearer. The mocking summons, "come, Kit, Kit, Kit," signals Walsingham's preference for the pet name, reinforced by his threefold repetition of it. The summons, moreover, imitates someone calling a cat, which would suggest that his choice is prompted by a sense of appropriateness resulting from the feline associations attached to *Kit* and enhanced by its apophony with *cat* and its homophony with *kit*. Walsingham's substitution of *Kit* for *Christopher*, together with the semantic re-motivation of the familiar name attending it, is lexicalised in the nonce form *cattified*. The grammatical realisation of the verb, the past participle, marks the completion of this double process of substitution and re-motivation, definitively establishing thereby Marlowe's felinity. The semantic equivalence of *Kit* with *cat* thus established, they no longer co-occur in the novel as co-referential terms.

4.3. A Preliminary Definition of Marlowe's Felinity

According to the analysis carried out in the foregoing section, the pairing of *Kit* with *cat* is meant to bring about the semantic contagion of the first term by the second so that the name epitomises the felinity of the bearer. Felinity, however, calls forth a broad array of different, and often conflicting, associations. First, there are the physical characteristics attributed to cats such as agility, speed and suppleness, followed by typically feline habits such as their being nocturnally active. Then there are the anthropomorphising personal traits commonly ascribed to cats. Engaging characteristics such as curiosity and playfulness are balanced against less endearing ones such as contumacy, self-centredness and standoffishness, not to mention downright negative traits like capriciousness, fickleness, malevolence and viciousness and morally ambivalent ones like sensuality and voluptuousness. As nocturnal creatures, cats are seen as mysterious and even threatening animals allied with the forces of evil, hence their association with witchcraft and sorcery. Cats, in the final analysis, are creatures that bring forth contradictory responses: they are at once frail and vulnerable animals to be petted and protected, and predatory and ill-natured beasts to be feared and mistrusted. In attributing felinity to him, therefore, Marlowe is burdened with the ambiguity of the animals he is likened to through the phonological bonding of *Kit* with *cat*.

4.3.1. The Opposition between Kit *and* Cat

Perhaps the first inkling of the moral ambivalence attending the semantic contagion of *Kit* is found in excerpt [2]. In 4.2.2 it was argued that sentence-initial *Cat* is a personal

name, with the implication that it is an alternative form of calling Marlowe. It was also said that as a name *Cat* is descriptive in that it characterises its bearer as having a wild, ungovernable character. Consequently, in considering it as an alternative name to *Kit*, the Narrator insinuates that Marlowe is an impassioned, turbulent character given to violent accesses of spite. In the description given of him following [2] the avoidance of eye-contact gives the impression of furtiveness and mistrustfulness, qualities often attributed to cats and suggesting guilt regarding his outbursts of malice. Owing to this wild streak in his character, *Cat* would be an appropriate name to give him in that it reflects Marlowe's cattiness, a penchant to say unkind and wounding things to other people.

Although *Cat* alludes to one of the less amiable facets of Marlowe's personality, the Narrator nevertheless sticks to *Kit*. The possessive *my* limiting *cat* in [1] has the effect of making the phrase an endearment expressing the feelings of tenderness the Narrator has for him, sentiments that are transferred to *Kit* so that the name is an index to the Narrator's emotional involvement with Marlowe. As well as affection and sympathy, however, tenderness implies a strong desire to look after the object of these feelings prompted by a keen awareness of his vulnerability. Not only does the Narrator empathise with Marlowe but also feels pity for him, despite the latter's vicious temper. This impression is reinforced by the semantic contagion resulting from the homophony of *Kit* and *kit*, educed by the apophony of the name with *cat*. As the end-clipped form of *kitten*, a byword for feebleness and vulnerability, the non-onomastic co-homophone transfers the poignant connotations it carries to the name, making its bearer an object of pity and compassion. Returning to the description once again, the detail of Marlowe not having a full moustache, a gender signal traditionally symbolising virility, is consonant with the connotations of vulnerability carried by *kit* and transferred to *Kit* by virtue of their homophonous relation.

Kit, in short, reveals a facet of Marlowe's personality that stands in direct contrast to that evoked by *Cat*. As well as abrasive and intractable, he is frail and vulnerable. The Narrator's preference for *Kit* over *Cat* gives to understand that whatever disapproval Marlowe's moral shortcomings might have earned are outweighed by the fear and pity aroused by his ultimate fate.

4.3.2. The Homophony of Kitticat *with* kitticat

Where the connotations of frailty and vulnerability are most explicit is in the reduplicative compound in excerpt [5]. In view of the disparity between the nursery playfulness conveyed by *Kitticat* and the dignity conferred by *Reverend*, the compound is used to poke fun at Marlowe and his giving himself airs of a man of the world before his family. Compounds formed by the partial reduplication of their first element are often used to disparage their referents by suggesting instability, vacillation or any other negative trait through the sound changes which take place within them (Quirk et al. 1985: 1579-80). By virtue of its temporary onomastic status, however, *Kitticat* also insinuates Marlowe's helplessness before the dangers which now beset him as an untried government agent *en route* to his first mission at Rheims. The vowel linking *Kit-* to *-cat* is homophonous with the diminutive suffix *-y*, enabling the compound to be re-analysed as *kitty cat*. The metanalysis both re-triggers and reinforces the associations of frailty and vulnerability already carried by *kit* and transferred to its onomastic co-homophone.

The poignancy of *Kitticat* is a result of its homophonous relation with *kitticat* in [4]. The intended tenor of the drowning-cat metaphor, tenor being the subject described by a metaphor (Brooke-Rose 1958: 9; Cuddon 1979: 687; Pulman 1987 [1973]: 145; Wales 1989: 456), is the Jesuit missionaries sent over from the English College in Rheims to restore England to obedience to Rome, an objective entailing the deposition of Queen Elizabeth in favour of the imprisoned Queen Mary of Scotland, and therefore to be accounted an act of high treason. Their mission, the feline comparison implies, is foredoomed to failure, making capture and an ignominious death the inevitable lot of the priests: hence the backhanded compliment of their courage as suicidal folly. Francis Walsingham's description of the Jesuits' predicament mirrors Marlowe's current situation as well. Like the priests he is going to spy on, Marlowe is being sent into enemy territory, and a similar fate will probably await him if he is discovered. Although he accomplishes his mission successfully, the homophony of *kitticat* with *Kitticat* foreshadows the difficulties which will beset and eventually overwhelm him. As the novel reaches its dénouement, Marlowe's plight is analogous to that of Walsingham's imaginary cat: he is out of his depth, and his frenzied efforts to stay afloat are useless to stop him from going under, identifying the image of the drowning cat as an integral part of the feline characterisation of Marlowe.

4.3.3. The Contrast of the Feline and Canine Metaphor

As mentioned in 4.2.2, Walsingham's *lapsus linguae* in excerpt [3], in which he inadvertently addresses Marlowe as *Cat* instead of *Kit*, underscores the addressee's felinity. The explanation offered to excuse his mistake, "you are no dog," is a further reinforcement of Marlowe's feline identity established by the phonological and semantic relations of *Kit* with *cat*. This sets up a contrast between *Cat* and *dog* which assists in the feline characterisation of Marlowe, although to appreciate the contribution of the cat-dog binarism it is necessary to turn to the broader context in which Walsingham's slip of the tongue is made.

The discourse marker that precedes the mistaken vocative address to Marlowe, *Well*, signals a change of subject in the conversation the newly acquainted friends are engaged in. The topic they have just dealt with is Walsingham's servant Ingram Frizer, introduced by the offhand comment "I leave reading to my man Frizer" [p.34] and rounded off with the following description of him:

> Frizer is a dog and a good dog. He likes being a dog. He is never happier than when fawning and cringing. There are some men born to be dogs. And yet he reads and tells me what he reads. He would serve me in all ways. Lackey and groom and schoolmaster. He licks my hand, but there the licking ends [pp.34-5].

The image of the dog that grovels in its master's presence conveys an image of fidelity verging on absolute servility, an impression driven home with the repetition of the noun *dog* and the sycophantic overtones of *fawning*, *cringing* and *licking*. In identifying Frizer with a dog, Walsingham also draws a sharp distinction between his manservant and his new friend, explicitly formulated with the statement that Marlowe is "no dog." The excuse for having addressed Marlowe as *Cat* is also a negative characterisation of him: he is no dog because he does not possess the canine traits of intense loyalty and obsequiousness externalised by the self-abasing actions of fawning, cringing and licking. By implication the denial of these traits affirm the putatively feline qualities of independence and emotional self-sufficiency suggested by the nickname *Cat*.

Walsingham's canine description of Frizer not only sets him up as a foil to Marlowe, it also foreshadows their future enmity and the death of the latter at the hands of the former. Dogs and cats are natural enemies, and in a fight the cat as a rule comes out worse. What divides them, paradoxically, is their devotion to Walsingham: Marlowe falls in love with him, and Frizer feels duty-bound not only to serve but protect his

master as well[21]. Their rivalry over Walsingham's affections points to other traits typically associated with dogs that serve as a counterpoint to the deceptively harmless canine characterisation of Frizer, namely jealousy and ferocity towards outsiders. As well as Walsingham's lapdog, Frizer assumes the typically canine role of guard dog by taking on himself the duty of frightening off all interlopers that seek to harm or lead his master astray. Of the two facets of his canine character, then, it is the second that predominates insomuch as the ever-vigilant guard dog is the face Frizer shows to Marlowe when they eventually meet. And since Walsingham's manservant is the man who eventually kills Marlowe, the feral implications of the canine characterisation of Frizer throws into relief the identification of debility with felinity established by the drowning-cat metaphor and embodied in *Kit* via the homophony of *Kitticat* with *kitticat*.

4.4. Recapitulation

The function performed by the phonological relation of *Kit* with *cat* reviewed in this chapter would seem to be that of establishing an analogy between Marlowe and a cat. The analogy, underscored by the feline features attributed to him in the sentences following extract [2], reflects a form of seeing Marlowe which enables him to be apprehended as an exemplar of cat. This would mean the instances of apophony are as much a trope as a scheme insomuch as it is a pattern of sound that conveys a means of conceptualising the main character of *A Dead Man in Deptford*. In other words, the *Kit-cat* apophony may be regarded as the vehicle for a conceit, a highly elaborate and fanciful figurative device that expresses an ingenious idea popular in the literature of the Tudor, Jacobean and Caroline periods (Cuddon 1979: 144). In terms of cognitive linguistics, the feline conceit is a framing device whereby the main character is defined against the reader's background assumptions of what kind of creatures cats are. Also, owing to the semantic contagion undergone by the name from its phonological bond with *cat*, the qualities subsumed under the rubric of *felinity* are hypostatised in *Kit*. As a result, the use of the name Marlowe is habitually called by is at once an instance of what Fairclough (1995: 94-101) calls congruent and metaphorical naming, congruent naming here understood as calling somebody by their name, and metaphorical naming calling somebody by a designation denoting or identifying an entity to which the named is

[21] The term *master* also contributes to the canine characterisation of Frizer insomuch as it denotes the owner of a dog as well the man a servant attends.

likened. *Kit* is a congruent because it is derived from Marlowe's forename, but it is also metaphorical because it characterises him as a cat. In calling the protagonist *Kit*, the Narrator not only names him but also tracks the metaphorical representation of Marlowe as a cat thrown into a tub to be drowned.

The sheer abundance of qualities conventionally attributed to cats, however, poses the problem of deciding which of these qualities are relevant for the characterising function carried out by the feline conceit. The phonological schemes examined in this chapter furnish enough clues to establish felinity as a contradictory quality as far as Marlowe is concerned, although one of the conflicting facets outweighs the other. The apophony of *Kit* with onomastic *Cat* in excerpt [3] suggests the more tempestuous and vicious attributes popularly ascribed to cats, as opposed to the feebleness and incapacity to defend oneself conveyed by the homophony of *Kitticat* and *kitticat*. The one relation causes *Kit* to epitomise perverseness, and the other vulnerability; but the preference of *Kit* over *Cat* as a name for the protagonist signifies the predominance of vulnerability over perverseness as the trait that defines him. The sense of impotence the drowning-cat metaphor confers on *Kit* is enhanced by the contrast of the feline conceit with the canine characterisation of Frizer. The feline-canine opposition not only symbolises their incompatibility, it also presages the murder of Marlowe by Walsingham's manservant, making *Kit* an emblem for victimisation.

Conceits are susceptible to classification according to the idea or concept they express, and in this regard may be viewed as a supporting motif to a recurrent theme. Accordingly the relation of the apophony between *Kit* and *cat* with the identification of Marlowe with a cat is analogous to that which obtains between a motif and a theme. To be considered as a motif, however, the *Kit-cat* apophony must occur with certain frequency, as repetition is the defining property of a motif. On close inspection of the narrative, enough instances are found of this phonological relation to warrant its consideration as a motif, although these other occurrences have another function besides that of identifying Marlowe. The apophony of *Kit* with *cat* also functions as a cohesive tie, partly by virtue of its repetition but mainly because they alert the reader to parallels between the passages they occur in which otherwise might have been passed unnoticed. Also, interpreted as a conceit, the phonological relation contributes to the coherence of the narrative, not only by sustaining but also linking the feline analogy with other themes. Just how the *Kit-cat* apophony helps to hold the text together will be the subject of the next chapter.

5. The Interlinking of the Feline Conceit with Narrative Motif

This chapter will centre on the contribution of phonological schemes containing *Kit* to the cohesion of the narrative, more specifically on the role they play in bringing together passages occurring in different parts of *A Dead Man in Deptford* but displaying parallels which enable the linked passages to be recognised as variations of the same narrative motif. The linking function of the schemes entails the concurrent repetition of the paired terms in the passages they connect so that they will be basically considered as formal motifs. Despite this emphasis on their cohesive function, the role of phonological schemes as foregrounding devices has not fallen into abeyance entirely. To alert the reader to the correspondences among the connected passages, the repeated schemes must first be sufficiently conspicuous to draw attention to themselves. Neither is the characterising function of the schemes completely inoperative, although Marlowe's character is revealed largely through the depiction of his behaviour in the passages to be reviewed. The synonymy of *Kit* with *cat* established by the apophony between the two terms brings a feline perspective to bear on Marlowe's actions so that these will be interpreted as manifestations of his felinity.

The instances of phonological bonding to be seen in this chapter are contained in the following excerpts:

6. Francis Kett, Kit's tutor in theology, had been sequestered for some weeks and his cats had been let loose on the streets. Of these he had had many, but twelve in particular that he called his Apostles and named for them. Kit had the smell of those cats in his nostrils still [p.6]
7. Kett spoke mildly with mild interest, his face thrusting into Kit's [p.7]
8. So Kit mourns for Kett, Hariot said, stroking [p.158]
9. He had on his lap a black cat that looked on Kit as in recognition [p.202]
10. Oh, Kit, Kit, are we not friends? And with the change of tone the cat began purring [p.203].

Before going on to examine how these schemes interact with the narrative motifs they are a part of, it is convenient to account for an apparent inconsistency in the choice of extracts. First, there is a greater variety of phonological patterning in comparison to those analysed in the preceding chapter: the alliteration between *Kett* and *Kit* in [6]-[7], the alliteration between *Kett* and *cats* in [6], the apophony of *Kit's* with *cats* in [6], the apophony of *Kit* with *Kett* in [8], and the apophony of *cat* with *Kit* in [9]-[10]. Second, as can be inferred by their page references, the excerpts come from three passages: the scenario of [6]-[7] is a tutorial given by a Cambridge divine with unorthodox views, that of [8] is a conclave of free-thinkers presided by Sir Walter Raleigh, and that is of [9]-[10] a briefing given by the acting head of Francis Walsingham's intelligence service.

On looking at the phonological schemes in each excerpt, however, one immediately notices that none of them occurs in all three passages: the phonological relations of *Kit* and *cat* are present in the first and third passages, but not the second; and the phonological relations between *Kit* and *Kett* are found in the first and second passages, but not the third. This would suggest that the first passage is connected to both the second and third, but between the latter two passages there is no connection. The absence of overt connectivity is balanced out by the presence of *Kit* in all the phonological schemes, its feline connotations, brought out by the adverbial clause *stroking*, educing *cat* in excerpt [8] and thereby enabling a link to be established between the second and third passages. Although there is no exact repetition of the same phonological scheme in each of the three passages, the schemes are sufficiently similar to one another to act as devices that connect the passages and draw attention to the parallels they have.

5.1. The Colloquy Motif

Besides the presence of Marlowe, signalled by the occurrence of *Kit*, the three passages among which the five extracts are distributed share other features. In all three passages Marlowe is depicted engaged, to varying degrees, in conversation: with his tutor in the first passage, with his fellow debaters in the second, and with his case officer in the third. This common element of conversation identifies the passages as enactments of what might be termed the colloquy motif. In each conversation, moreover, Marlowe receives two directives by his various interlocutors, a recommendation and an order: a recommendation from his tutor to be discreet and an injunction to join him in prayer, a commission by his host to copy out a religious tract and a recommendation from a debater to be discreet, and the assignment of a mission from his superior and a warning against being indiscreet. Finally, Marlowe is a cause of irritation for his interlocutors: on account of his blank refusal to comply with his tutor's invitation to prayer, the unwanted attention his unruly behaviour has brought to the Raleigh circle, and his refusal to accept the mission he is entrusted with. All three passages, then, contain the same sequence of events, namely the issuing of a directive, Marlowe's refusal to comply with the directive and the agitation of the person who issued the directive. That the three passages can be broken down into the tripartite pattern just described makes them motifs in the sense the term is used in narrative grammar, that is, sequenced

semantic representations of narrated states or events (Doležel 1976: 132), expressed in this case by the predication

Marlowe moves his interlocutor to anger.

That the sequence occurs at three different points of the narrative makes the passage a motif in Sage & Sage's sense of a repeated local feature. The two notions of motif are relevant to cohesion in that they both lend consistency to the structure of the narrative, but the latter makes an active contribution to the feline characterisation of Marlowe, the agent of the narrative motif on all three occasions. By representing Marlowe on each occasion as a recalcitrant and provocative character, the motif creates and reinforces the impression of waywardness and wilfulness. To see how this motif makes *Kit* a byword for fractiousness, it might be worthwhile to start with a more detailed comparison of the passages referred to with regard to the narrative motifs they share.

5.1.1. The Tutorial Scenario

The tutorial is narrated in the manner of a flashback inserted in the opening episode of the novel, in which Marlowe is introduced as "an undergraduate of the college of Corpus Christi (…) committed (…) to the tedious study of theology and the eventual taking of orders" [p.5] working off the frustration generated by the uncongenial nature of his studies by baiting his more conformist dormitory fellows by irreverently picking holes in Protestant doctrine. Religious dogma also bulks large in the lesson given by Francis Kett, as most of it is taken up with a lecture on the divine nature of Jesus Christ. Kett's views on the topic are scarcely consistent with orthodox teaching: his contention that Christ "not God but God *in potentia*" [p.7] is bluntly described by his student as heresy. Instead of denying the unorthodoxy of his religious convictions, Kett's resolution to dissemble his Socinian beliefs acknowledges it: "We must observe discretion. Machiavelli says that we must conform and show the world what we are not" [p.7]. The use of the first person plural seems to include Marlowe among those who must hide their true opinions to survive, which would make his tutor's pronouncement as much a friendly word of advice to a potential catechumen as a statement of a general principle that everybody would do well to bear in mind. However, judging by his dismissive summing up of Kett as one "[c]learly out of his wits" [p.8], Marlowe is not only untouched by the former's religious fervour but also unimpressed by the recommendation to "observe discretion."

The precept of concealing one's real beliefs behind a show of conformity is the first of the two directives issued to Marlowe in this passage. The second comes at the end of the tutorial in the form of a direct command:

> Kneel with me now among these creatures made by God on the tenth day of Creation and let us pray for the realm's purgation, lustration, salvation. Kneel [p.7].

Marlowe refuses point-blank to comply, countering Kett's demand with the rejoinder "I am not here to kneel." Surprised at the refusal, Kett nevertheless manages to keep his composure:

> —You are not? Kett spoke mildly with mild interest, his face thrusting into Kit's. You are not here to kneel?

The answer given to the echo question, "[t]here is a time and place for kneeling," finally throws Kett into a rage:

> Kett all of a sudden boiled.
> —Kneel kneel kneel damn you kneel. You are to be blasted, sir. I know of your sins.

Like the recommendation to be discreet and avoid drawing attention to oneself, Marlowe disregards the order to join his tutor in prayer and provokes him to anger.

The exchange reproduced and glossed on above can be assimilated into the description Ungerer and Schmid (1996: 140-3), drawing on Lakoff (1987) and Kövecses (1988; 1990), give of the emotion scenario for anger. Anger is accounted for as an emotional state which is the outcome of a process involving five stages, namely wrongdoer provokes self, self experiences anger, self attempts to control anger, self loses control and self takes action against wrongdoer. Accordingly, Marlowe's non-compliance is identifiable with the cause of Kett's anger, Kett's squaring up to his insolent student with the behavioural effect of the anger he experiences, his deceptively mild echo questions with the attempt to dominate his indignation, the outburst of rage with the loss of self-control, and the prediction of divine retribution with the action he takes against his provoker. Owing to the note of discord on which the episode ends, the impression created of Marlowe is one of lack of respect and wanton insolence.

5.1.2. The Conclave Scenario

Kett's advice that "[w]e must observe discretion" is echoed by Thomas Hariot's admonition that "you must learn discretion" [p.158], construed likewise as exhortation against attracting unwanted attention. In both cases the modal verb *must* seeks to

impress on Marlowe the importance of taking heed of the advice given him. Hariot's urging to discretion differs from Kett's in the substitution of singular *you* for inclusive *we*, and the verb *learn* for *observe*. These changes strongly imply that Marlowe does not have the quality he is urged to exercise, and that he would do well to acquire it. The second exhortation is as much a reminder that Marlowe has a responsibility to be discreet as an urgent recommendation given for his own good.

The double reading of Hariot's directive as both an imposition and a piece of advice is due to the news of Kett's death and the stern rebuke Marlowe receives in the wake of the revelation. Excerpt [8] represents Hariot's summing up of Marlowe's dejection at the news he brings that his former tutor has been burned for heresy. In the course of the relation it transpires that Kett's unhappy fate is traceable to his failure to practise what he preached: he confided his Socinian views to another student, who promptly denounced him to the authorities. In the light of Kett's execution, then, Hariot's recommendation is to be read in part as a warning of what might befall Marlowe if he does not follow the advice to act with circumspection. Marlowe's comment apropos of his tutor on the dire consequences loose talk leads to brings on Raleigh's reprimand:

> —There is too much talk about, Kit said. There is leaking.
> —If there is that, Raleigh said bluntly, it will be from one that cannot keep sealed under drink what has been said in sobriety [p.158].

The verbal noun *leaking* is an object of a pun through which Marlowe's verbal incontinence is traced to his heavy drinking so that it simultaneously signifies the unauthorised disclosure of confidential information and the uncontrolled passing of water (Partridge 1968 [1947]: 133). His inability to hold either his drink or his tongue exposes Marlowe to two types of retributive action, both referred to by the culprit himself. The first is to suffer the same fate as Kett if his drunken ravings reach the ears of the authorities, a fate which would be shared by the other members of Raleigh's circle: hence the irritation of its president. The second sanction would involve Marlowe's expulsion from the clique, a possibility intuited in the sequel to Raleigh's rebuke:

> —You mean?
> —We are a sober company addicted only to tobacco.
> —I see. I am not wanted.

Following on from this tense exchange, Hariot's entreaty that Marlowe should "learn discretion" is a more diplomatic rendering of Raleigh's ultimatum: either he stops

advertising the clandestine activities of the group by his disorderly conduct, or he stops coming to their meetings.

Raleigh's reproof enacts an emotion scenario which parallels Kett's outburst of anger seen in 5.1.1. Unlike the latter, however, the cause is not Marlowe's refusal to comply with a command. Indeed, earlier in the episode he shows uncharacteristic readiness to accept Raleigh's commission to copy out a passage from an anti-Arian tract for discussion in a future meeting. Rather, Raleigh's irritation is brought on by Marlowe's irresponsible conduct when he is not attending the sessions of his intellectual circle. The request also points to another correspondence between the gathering of the Raleigh clique and tutorial with Kett. Prompted by the sensation caused by the recent première of Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, Raleigh proposes to hold a discussion on Christ's divinity in a spirit of free enquiry, a proposal which is potentially Socinian to the extent that the conclusions reached by such the discussion might be a denial of Christ's divine nature. To those schooled in the belief that Christ's divinity is beyond question the rationality of Raleigh and his associates is as bad as Kett's mysticism because it is conducive to atheism. Nicholas Faunt's reference to "Raleigh's strange doings with mathematicians and atheists," already quoted in 4.1, is indicative of the suspicions his speculations have raised in official circles, which accounts for the urgency of Hariot's exhortation to discretion.

In the immediate sequel to the meeting of the Raleigh circle Marlowe comes across as impervious to the salutary reminder served by Kett's death of dangers entailed in airing unorthodox ideas. Hariot's plea is taken by its recipient as a cue to take his leave so as to write a play that "lacked discretion totally" [p.159]. Its indiscretion is partly because of its controversial subject-matter, the struggle for power from an avowedly Machiavellian standpoint, though mainly on account of its even more controversial topicality, in that *The Massacre at Paris* re-enacts contemporary political events. Marlowe's refusal to moralise on the excesses committed by the villain-hero of the piece, Henry of Guise, is also likely to be seen as an endorsement of the Duke's unscrupulous methods of gaining and holding on to power, marking the dramatist out as an exponent of the self-seeking amorality embodied by his dramatic creation. Not only is Marlowe incapable of keeping his radical ideas to himself, he also insists on disseminating them through the public playhouse. In engaging on this project, he symbolically thumbs his nose at Hariot and his calls for discretion, displaying once again the refractory wilfulness he previously showed his tutor in theology.

5.1.3. The Briefing Scenario

As in the other two episodes under survey, the moment of highest tension in the interview Marlowe has with Robert Poley, the interim head of the Service, is identifiable with the emotion scenario represented in the passage. As with the tutorial, the emotion scenario is triggered by Marlowe's resistance to doing as he is bidden. As soon as it begins, Poley's briefing is cut short by Marlowe informing that he no longer considers the intelligence service to be of his concern:

> —The Spanish menace, remember that, that only are we engaged in.
> —Not I, not any longer.
> Poley's stroking hand tightened and the cat squealed, though soon mollified with a gentle scratching beneath its chin [p.202].

Marlowe's negative is reminiscent of his reply to Kett's summons to prayer, "I am not here to kneel," and has a similar effect on his present interlocutor. Poley's chagrin is momentarily betrayed by his inadvertent ill-treatment of the cat he is caressing, as well as the adoption of a sharper tone in the subsequent conversation than he is accustomed to using. Unlike Kett, Poley by and large manages to master the exasperation caused by Marlowe's insubordination so that the fourth stage of the emotion scenario, loss of control, is not realised in this case.

Again like the other two episodes, the taking of reprisals is referred to as a possibility rather than imminent course of action. After reminding his subordinate that he is not free to leave the Service as he pleases, Poley gives him the assignment he is to complete, which Marlowe promptly turns down pleading his commitments with the playhouse:

> —I do not accept the mission. You look hurt and your cat views me with dislike, but no matter. Another mission I may take, but not now. The play must be finished and put into rehearsal [p.203].

The battle of wills between Poley and Marlowe follows the inverse pattern to the one discernible in the stormy confrontation between Kett and Marlowe, roughly a reminder of an obligation met by a declaration of *non serviam*, followed by an order met by a refusal to comply with it. The outcome is nevertheless the same, namely that Marlowe gets his way, although with the threat of retaliatory action for his obduracy.

Less forthright than Kett, Poley refers to the negative consequences of Marlowe's rebelliousness indirectly:

—These fripperies and frapperies of plays. If you will not you will not but you must be warned.

—Warned of what?

—You have been privy to much that is most secret and you are not to be let loose to blather among playmen and others. Oh, Kit, Kit, are we not friends? And with the change of tone the cat began purring.

In cautioning Marlowe against revealing the secrets he is privy to, Poley resorts to the same verbal periphrasis employed in Kett's presage of his wayward pupil's perdition. Yet whereas "[y]ou are to be blasted" is unequivocally a prediction, the verb phrase in "you are not to be let loose" is open to two readings. On the one hand *are not to be* can be read as a prohibition, in which case Marlowe's brief is to be construed as a peremptory reminder not to disclose sensitive information. On the other hand it can be interpreted as a contingent future (Quirk et al. 1985: 143), like Kett's invocation, which carries ominous implications for Marlowe. Under the second interpretation, Poley is letting Marlowe know that he will not divulge official secrets because the necessary measures to silence him will be taken if there are grounds to suspect that he has turned traitor. Poley's admonition acts as prohibition on unauthorised talk of state business at one level, and a veiled threat to have Marlowe done away with at another.

Together with the minatory "you must be warned," Poley's strictures against giving away confidential information in effect constitute a call for discretion, like those made by Kett and Hariot. Poley's attempt at restoring amity through an appeal to their friendship is also a ploy to ensure that Marlowe does not ignore it by assuring him that discretion is in his own interests as well as those of the organisation he serves. Indiscretion not only compromises the operational efficiency of the Service, Poley gives to understand, but also endangers the lives of its agents, Marlowe's included.

5.1.4. Thematic Concerns Common to the Colloquies

Although with noticeable differences with respect to their sequencing, the events depicted in the three episodes may be regarded as realisations of the same semantic frames. All three passages represent a colloquy scenario in which Marlowe receives two directives, a recommendation and a command, and provokes his interlocutors. In the tutorial the recommendation is the first frame to be realised, followed by the command, and finally the provocation. In the meeting the recommendation is the last frame to be realised, and the command the first, while in the briefing the provocation is followed by the command and the recommendation. The permutations these frames are subject to nevertheless do not detract from the fact that the episodes they are integrated in are

enactments of the same narrative motif. In their capacity of realisations of the same motif, the three colloquies assist in the apprehension of the underlying themes the episodes share, of which two can be clearly identified.

One of the themes is explicitly referred to in the tutorial and conclave scenarios, namely discretion —or rather indiscretion. On all three occasions the importance of discretion is impressed on Marlowe, and on all three occasions his behaviour creates the impression that these urgings are lost on him. In the context in which the recommendations are made discretion is equated to confidentiality, not revealing what one knows. The implication carried by the recommendations, that Marlowe is indiscreet, is true, but only in part. Marlowe, as Raleigh complains, has a propensity to shoot his mouth off about issues that are best left unsaid, but these indiscretions concern his own opinions. He never, as Poley insinuates, betrays the trust placed in him and willingly discloses what has been said to him in confidence. The doubts cast on Kett's sanity after recalling the tutorial are indiscreet in the sense that they are a public expression of disrespect for a figure of authority, but they reveal nothing about the heretical beliefs the tutor holds. Disrespect for authority is another form of indiscretion, and it is one Marlowe is clearly guilty of. The refusal to comply with a command is an affront for the person who issues it, and it is all the more offensive when that person is a position of authority, like Kett and Poley. Marlowe's indiscretion is definable as a resistance to knuckle under the authority of others on the one hand, and an inability to keep his unorthodox opinions to himself on the other.

The second theme is inferable from the respective content of the conversations represented in each of the episodes. What these conversations have in common with each other is nonconformity. Kett effectively denies the divinity of Christ by deferring it to his final resurrection on Doomsday, Raleigh and his circle take issue with the unquestioned assumption of Christ's divinity, and Poley's reference to "the Spanish menace" alludes to recusant English Catholics allegedly working as a fifth column for a foreign power. Religious dissent, then, emerges as the element in which Marlowe moves, although his relation to dissidence comes across as ambivalent. In the tutorial he is depicted more as being exposed to heretical opinions than holding them, and his dismissal of his tutor as a harmless crank leaves no doubt that he is proof against Kett's Socinian views. At Raleigh's conclave, however, Marlowe participates actively in the debate on the divinity of Christ, which makes him a sceptic, scepticism being synonymous with atheism. It is significant that Raleigh's request for the anti-Arian tract

is the only directive Marlowe complies with, a compliance which suggests like-mindedness. On the other hand, Poley's preliminary rundown on the activities of political and religious malcontents gives the impression that he sees Marlowe as "one of the faithful hounds that smell out treason and dissidence" [p.244]. Nicholas Faunt's dark references to "mathematicians and atheists" gives to understand that Raleigh's circle, mentioned in passing at the briefing, is thought of as a hotbed of "treason and dissidence," and that their activities should therefore be placed under close watch. Marlowe's association with Raleigh, Poley believes, would make his subordinate the perfect plant if he could be persuaded, or compelled, to turn informer on his patron. Whatever his relation to nonconformity might be, Marlowe is in continual contact with it.

Nonconformity and indiscretion are traits that can be related to some of the characteristics associated with cats. To begin with, Marlowe's contumacy is identifiable with the supposed intractability of felines. Cats are thought of as fiercely independent creatures that bitterly resent intrusions into their affairs and attempts to curtail their freedom of action. The reason Marlowe gives for refusing to accept the mission he is assigned is interpretable in this light as an affirmation of his independence. He has a stage play to finish, and absolutely nothing is to get in the way of its completion: his literary concerns take precedence over all else, even affairs of state. His obstinacy applies to his opinions as well: he is not only disinclined to take received truths on trust but also persists in airing his views at the slightest pretext, even when it is more prudent to keep his peace. In behaviour and in thought Marlowe, like the cat, is a law unto himself and persists in going where he lists regardless of whose toes he steps on.

5.2. The Extension of the Feline Conceit

The analysis of the colloquy motif has led to the identification of another trait traditionally associated with felinity, namely intractability. To some extent this feline quality is already hinted at in the onomastic reading of *Cat* in excerpt [3] examined in 4.2.2, where it is stated that as a nickname the term is indicative of a temperamental character. However, the preference for *Kit* has meant that the more pathetic feline connotations of impotence and vulnerability have been emphasised by the *Kit-cat* apophony, an emphasis underwritten by the homophony of *Kitticat* and *kitticat*. The embodiment of the feline conceit these phonological schemes support turned out to be the metaphor of the drowning cat, an interpretative frame which casts Marlowe into the

role of the helpless victim. The Marlowe who emerges from the three episodes discussed in the previous section —the headstrong young man with a mind of his own who is not afraid of speaking it— suggests that the drowning-cat frame apprehends his personality only partially, as it fails to account for his transgressive nature. To square the apparently conflicting attributes of intractability and impotence, it is necessary to look at other manifestations of the feline conceit.

5.2.1. The Philosopher's Cat

Much of the first half of the opening paragraph of *A Dead Man in Deptford* is taken up with a metaphysical disquisition in which its central figure is a cat:

> There was a philosopher who spoke of the cat that mews to be let out and then mews to be let in again. In the interim, does it exist? There is in us all the solipsist tendency which is a simulacrum of the sustentive power of the Almighty, namely what we hold in the eye exists, remove the eye or let it be removed therefrom and there is disintegration total if temporary. But of the time of the cat's absence a man may also rightly suppose that it is fully and corporeally in the world down to its last whisker [p.3].

Ostensibly the purpose of this excursus is the exposition and resolution of an ontological problem, namely that the absence of entity does not entail its non-existence. The next sentence is excerpt [1], "[a]nd so let it be with my cat or Kit," which introduces the main character of the novel. The pro-form *so* refers back to the proposition expressed in the last sentence of the quoted passage, bringing about the extrapolation to the Narrator's memoir of the solution given to the problem posed at the beginning. The extrapolation itself is made in the sentence immediately following [1]:

> I must suppose that what I suppose of his doings behind the back of my viewings is of the nature of a stout link in the chain of his being, lost to my seeing, not palpable but of necessity existent [p.3].

The Narrator's philosophical musings, as he admits in the first sentence of his chronicle, turn out to be a justification for the conjectural nature of his account of Marlowe's life as a result of his focus on "happenings that I had no eye to eye knowledge of or concerning" [p.3]. What the Narrator is about to tell us is not so much a relation of what happened to Marlowe as what *must* have happened to him.

The connection made between excerpt [1] and the sentence preceding it in turn draws attention to the contrastive relation of *my cat* with *the cat*. The shift from the definite article to the possessive determiner indicates the non-equivalent nature of the repetition of *cat*: the same lexical item is used but applied to different referents. The absence of

co-reference is corroborated by the subsequent pronoun reference for each phrase: neuter pronouns for *the cat*, and masculine pronouns for co-referential *Kit* and *my cat*. The absence of co-reference between *my cat* and *the cat* nevertheless does not affect the phonological bond linking *Kit* to the head of the latter noun phrase, with the attendant implication that their phonetic similarities points to other correspondences. The correspondences implied are to be found in the identical pattern of behaviour predicated of the bearer of *Kit* and the referent of *cat*. Like the philosopher's cat, Marlowe is forever disappearing and reappearing from the Narrator's view, defining the latter's relationship with the former as a series of sporadic encounters separated by lengthy absences, which makes Marlowe an object of speculation rather than of observation, inferable from the Narrator's self-description as one "who observed him intermittently (…) on the margent of [Kit's] life" [p.3].

5.2.2. The Wandering-Cat Metaphor

The comings and goings of the philosopher's cat introduces what might be termed the wandering-cat metaphor, which, thanks to the parallel established between its movements and Marlowe's, functions as an interpretative frame for the protagonist. The framing metaphor of the wandering cat contrasts with that of the drowning cat, introduced in 4.3.2. The main difference between them appears to be that the latter metaphor is focused on Marlowe's parlous circumstances, especially towards the end of the novel, while the former centres on his footloose roving. Since both framing metaphors are facets of the same over-arching feline conceit, they each suggest a relation of causality between Marlowe's actions and circumstances. It is because of his cavalier attitude towards established beliefs and opinions that he finds himself in the predicament so graphically described by Francis Walsingham.

As the wandering-cat metaphor is introduced before the character it defines, the Narrator's account of the philosopher's cat anticipates Marlowe's movements. The anticipatory nature of the Narrator's metaphysical digression is faintly reminiscent of the typology applied to Christian biblical exegesis. According to typological reading of the Bible, the events and persons recorded in the Old Testament prefigure the life and teaching of Jesus Christ when the books comprising them are read in the light of the New Testament (Rivers 1994 [1979]: 140). Central to this reading of the Old Testament in terms of the New is the correlation between type and antitype, that is, the anticipatory figure of the Old Testament and its counterpart in the New Testament which fulfils it

and reveals its hidden meaning. If the typological reading of the Bible is extrapolated to the philosopher's cat, it will be seen that its relation to Marlowe is analogous to that of type to antitype. "And so let it be for my cat or Kit" not only introduces Marlowe as a wanderer but also foreshadows his wanderings. He, too, "mews to be let out and then mews to be let in again" until one day he departs never to return.

5.2.3. The Development of the Wandering-Cat Metaphor

The framing metaphor of the wandering cat operates at a number of different levels. At its most literal, it is indicative of Marlowe's geographical mobility. In his capacity of a spy he is frequently sent abroad to gather information on the activities of real or supposed enemies of the state, which involves him journeying to Rheims and Paris in France, Flushing in the Netherlands, and Edinburgh in Scotland. His residence in London results in a scaling down of the distances he covers, but not an abatement of his *Wanderlust*: he is depicted as continually traversing the city, with occasional forays to Canterbury, the Walsingham estate at Scadbury, and Deptford, the place where his wanderings are abruptly brought to an end. In the final analysis, then, Marlowe comes across as one that is forever on the move.

Marlowe's itinerancy is also suggestive of restlessness, an inability to remain long in the same place. At a metaphorical level, his agitated journeying to and fro is translated into emotional intensity, a character trait connoted by the nickname *Cat*. Intellectually, his restive spirit manifests itself as an irascible, inquiring mind that is not easily satisfied with ready-made *a priori* explanations. At this point itinerancy becomes errancy, or straying away from accepted standards of behaving and thinking. Errancy in turn is associated with standoffishness and waywardness, qualities believed to be typically feline, summarised by the wish to be allowed to go his own way and the tendency to rebel when constraints are placed on his freedom of movement. The peripatetic motif frames Marlowe intellectually and temperamentally as a man that will not let himself be stuck in traditional grooves of thought, regardless of the disapproval this may earn him.

Besides wilfulness, the parallel between Marlowe and the philosopher's cat contains the suggestions of vulnerability, already connoted by the non-onomastic homophone of *Kit*. In the fragment quoted in 5.2.1 the philosopher's cat is described as forever mewing to be let out and in. Although mewling of the cat is interpretable as a demand to be given the freedom to come and go as it pleases, and in a figurative sense Marlowe's

demand to be accepted on his own terms, the onomatopoeic verb *mew* conveys an impression of weakness that excites pity and the desire to protect. The conjoined clauses also imply the cat's dependence on the philosopher: without its master the cat is unable to leave or enter the house. Marlowe is likewise at the mercy of the powers he makes demands on, a situation which is likely to get him into trouble if he insists on coming and going at will. Although self-willed and refractory, Marlowe is at bottom a creature whose perverseness exposes him to forces he is powerless against and that eventually destroy him.

5.2.4. The Wandering-Cat and Drowning-Cat Metaphors

In the foregoing sub-section it was argued that the philosopher's cat has a double function to perform. First, its ceaseless arrivals and departures anticipate Marlowe's restless wanderings to and from the various locales he is depicted as visiting throughout *A Dead Man in Deptford*, thereby introducing the peripatetic motif. The characterisation of the protagonist as a wanderer is aided by the apophony of *Kit* with *cat*, and clinched by the anaphoric relation between the two terms in excerpt [1]. Second, the narrative motif established by the philosopher's cat introduces and supports the twin themes of transgression and vulnerability which inform the chronicle of Marlowe's *via dolorosa* to Deptford Strand. Again, the phonological bond between *Kit* and *cat*, underscored by their co-referentiality in [1], defines the main character as the transgressor who will eventually come to grief because of his meddling with received certainties.

Marlowe's felinity, or transgressive nature, cannot be pinned down to a specific locus in the narrative. Rather, it unfolds as the narrative advances, each instance of apophony of *Kit* with *cat* either revealing a new facet of his feline character or consolidating it by referring back to previous co-occurrences. The three passages examined in section 5.1 work out the thematic implications the cat conceit has for the novel through the narrative motifs they share, all of which are subsumable under the peripatetic motif introduced in the Narrator's mock-philosophical discussion with which he prefaces his memoir.

Starting at the literal level, the three passages in question are indicative of Marlowe's mobility, though social rather than geographical. While each passage depicts a colloquy, they are all set in different locales: an academic's study at Cambridge, a courtier's London residence, and the headquarters of the Elizabethan secret service, also situated in the capital. Although only a small sample of the milieux he moves about in, these

locales give an idea of diversity of the company Marlowe keeps, providing at the same time a possible explanation for his mobility. If his presence is required in so many different places, he cannot stay long at any of them, and another recurrent motif is his being called away from one place to be at another. Returning to the final sentence of the metaphysical disquisition on the philosopher's cat, the restrictive relative clause *that mews to be let out and then mews to be let in again* suggests that the cat is mobile of its own accord, and not in answer to a summons. Although frequently invited or ordered to be in attendance on his numerous acquaintances, Marlowe shows a similar desire to be off when he is bored or uncomfortable with the company he is with. In the meeting and the briefing episodes, for instance, he makes his exit on the pretext of professional commitments, his equivalent of mewing to be let out.

Marlowe's excuses are a slightly figurative rendering of the demand made by the cat to be allowed to go its own way. His disregard of the directives he receives on each occasion are more metaphorical reproductions of the cat's manifestation of its desire to leave. In refusing to follow the commands and recommendations he is given, Marlowe makes clear he wants out of the situations his interlocutors variously try to involve him in: he has no wish to be Kett's acolyte or continue under Poley's orders, nor is he inclined to follow Kett, Poley and Hariot's advice to observe discretion. His recalcitrance in each case is an exhibition of Marlowe's felinity, understood here as his desire to be allowed to go his own way. Such independence inevitably isolates him from his acquaintances, even like-minded individuals such as Raleigh and his associates. Marlowe frequents many circles but does not really belong to any of them, another possible cause for his endless comings and goings.

Marlowe's isolation combines with his outspokenness to make him an acutely vulnerable individual. Speaking his mind is likely to lose him friends and make him enemies while staying aloof, yet another feline trait, will mean he will have no one to turn to when his enemies conspire against him. The danger entailed in being friendless is made patent in the veiled threat issued by Poley, couched in a warning against divulging sensitive information. More than the comings and goings of the philosopher's cat, Marlowe's situation begins to bear an ever-increasing resemblance to the pathetic attempts at survival by Francis Walsingham's "kitticat cast in the tub for drowning." The spymaster's words unwittingly presage Marlowe's frantic attempts to evade the fate that will await him once he forfeits Poley's protection. In this respect the drowning cat,

like the philosopher's peripatetic cat, acts as a type that intimates Marlowe's eventual death at the hands of more predatory creatures.

5.3. Further Extensions of the Feline Conceit

Looking back at the episodes which make up the colloquy motif, one becomes aware of two other feline framing metaphors. The tutorial scenario ends with Kett uttering his malediction on Marlowe with "a struggling cat in his arms," and in the briefing episode "Poley's stroking hand tightened and the cat squealed" on hearing Marlowe say that he no longer considers himself under Poley's orders. Like the philosopher's cat and the drowning cat, the two mistreated cats bear a type-antitype relation to Marlowe, with the exception that they define the respective situations he finds himself in at those moments instead of prefiguring future scenarios. More than types, then, the cats act as analogues of Marlowe insofar as their circumstances reflect his own. Both the struggling-cat and maltreated-cat metaphors are interpretative frames which define Marlowe, and as a result can be subsumed under the feline conceit, together with the wandering-cat and drowning-cat metaphors. Because of their orientation towards Marlowe's circumstances rather than Marlowe himself, the two newly-identified framing metaphors can grouped together with the drowning-cat metaphor. Given the part of the novel in which each framing metaphor occurs, they may be regarded as representing different stages of Marlowe's tragic downfall. The struggling-cat metaphor occurs when Marlowe is a Cambridge undergraduate chafing under the ennui of university life, the point of departure of his progress to Deptford Strand. The maltreated-cat metaphor occurs at a moment when his fortunes are clearly on the wane but have not yet come to the pass presaged by the drowning-cat metaphor.

5.3.1. The Struggling-Cat Metaphor

Kett's study comes across as a cattery on account of the large number of felines that have made it their home. In principle this means a relation of affinity between Marlowe and the cats on account of the feline associations carried by *Kit*. In support of this view there is the detail that of the many cats he has there are twelve "that he called his Apostles and named for them" [p.6]. The naming convention Kett institutes symbolically places his relationship with his cats on the same footing as the master-disciple relation between Christ and the Apostles. As Marlowe's tutor in theology, the relationship that exists between Kett and his charge is literally that of master and

disciple. This has the effect of making Marlowe one of his cats, especially in view of the fact that Kett takes him into his confidence and expounds his vision of Christ's eventual divinity. In addition to being one of his "cats," Marlowe is included as one of Kett's Apostles.

As seen in 5.1.1, whatever hopes Kett may have cherished of making a convert out of Marlowe are soon dashed. Marlowe's rejection of his tutor's Socinian view of Christ is conveyed through the relation of difference that exists between the wayward pupil and the cats that overrun Kett's study. This impression of separateness is intimated by the contrast in person between *my cat* in [1] and *his cats* in [6]. If Marlowe is identified as the Narrator's cat he cannot be Kett's, in spite of their common felinity. The exclusion of Marlowe from Kett's brood of cats is accentuated by the determiner in *those cats*, also in excerpt [6]. Apart from distance in time and place, the deictic is also indicative of the moral distance that comes of disagreement.

If there is a cat that can be identified with Marlowe, then it is the cat that struggles in Kett's arms during its master's access of anger, even though it "purred as in approbation" [p.7] as Kett expatiates on Christ's apotheosis. However, the struggling cat exemplifies not so much Marlowe's dismissal of Kett's teachings as his dissatisfaction with the absurdly abstruse education he is receiving at Cambridge. When he is presented, Marlowe is described as being "committed," rather than devoted, to the study of theology. Devotion implies as much pleasure in as application to the studies the student is put to; but *committed* can suggest committal as well as convey commitment to study, giving to understand that the student is forced to occupy himself with the study of subjects he finds uncongenial. In the light of the frustration caused by a course of study regarded as pointless rigmarole, struggling of the cat both symbolises and refers back to the profane digs Marlowe makes at his chamber fellows prior to his remembrance of the tutorial. His captiousness is as much foot-stamping against the tedium of academic life as debunking of religious doctrine, although his bitchy remarks prefigure his more reasoned criticisms of politically motivated religious obscurantism of later life. The struggling cat also shows up how ineffectual Marlowe's rebellion is. However hard it struggles to escape from Kett's arms, the cat is too puny to get away. Marlowe's acerbic wit may shock his chamber fellows, but it cannot change his situation: he still remains, as Walsingham later describes him, "a boy at his books" [p.102]. In this regard the struggling-cat metaphor stands for feline debility and impotence as well, although less dramatically than the drowning-cat metaphor.

5.3.2. The Maltreated-Cat Metaphor

The recurrence of the apophony of *Kit* and *cat* in [9] links the briefing to the tutorial scenario, in which, as can be seen from the alliteration in [8], *Kit* enters into various phonological relations with the grammatical realisations of *cat*. The connection enables the reader to discover the similarities between the two scenarios, noticeably the feline presence in both. As in the tutorial, Marlowe's interlocutor is depicted with a cat on his lap, which also suffers the consequences of its master's discomforture at Marlowe's unco-operative behaviour. Whereas the cat on Kett's lap is startled by his outburst of anger, Poley's cat is hurt by the momentary tightening of his grip, although it recovers its well-being towards the end of the interview.

At one level Poley's cat externalises the various shifts of mood its master experiences throughout the *tête-à-tête*. First, the unsettling gaze it fixes on Marlowe as he waits for Poley to commence stands for its master's speculative frame of mind as he works out what tack to adopt by anticipating his subordinate's response to what he has to propose to him. Then, the squeal of pain the cat emits points to the exasperation Poley feels on hearing Marlowe inform him that he intends to give up intelligence work. Next, the gradual abating of the cat's fright as Poley comforts it parallels the recovery of its master's equanimity as he attempts to talk Marlowe out of his decision to leave the Service. Finally, the cat's purring signals Poley's decision to change tack as regards how he should deal with his recalcitrant agent, abandoning veiled threats for cajolement. The cat's expressiveness offers a way round Poley's suave inscrutability and into his devious mind. Marlowe says as much when, reiterating his rejection of the mission Poley assigns him, "[y]ou look hurt and your cat views me with dislike" [p.203]. The cat's perceived antipathy to him mirrors the pique its master feels at the independent line Marlowe is taking.

Besides a barometer for Poley's otherwise inaccessible states of mind, the cat is as an index to the predicament Marlowe finds himself at that moment. Despite getting his own way, he is figuratively as much in Poley's clutches as the cat is literally, so that the warning he is given can be read as a reminder that Marlowe need not expect he will always have it his own way as well as a caution against careless, or disloyal, talk. In keeping with the sinister undercurrent beneath Poley's words, the treatment received by the cat acts as an external correlate to the method of arm-twisting preferred by its master to bring refractory subordinates into line. The infliction of pain to the cat is a reflex

action provoked by the irritation caused by Marlowe's refusal, but at the same time it portends what might occur to him if he persists in being unreasonable. Similarly, the prompt resumption of petting signals Poley's self-control while signifying his preference for smooth-talking to more violent means of persuasion. It is interesting to note that his appeal to friendship breaks off the warning at the point where the consequences of Marlowe's unwillingness to co-operate should have begun. Poley is prepared to overlook his subordinate's disobedience and not take punitive action. The possibility that he will resort to more drastic expedients nevertheless remains, as it is in Poley's power to have Marlowe eliminated if cajoling and wheedling fail. Poley's cat, then, hypostatises Marlowe's *de facto* subjection to the semi-official body he works for, and as such is a symbol of impotence and vulnerability as well.

5.3.3. The Feline Conceit in Raleigh's Debating Circle

At both the tutorial and briefing the treatment meted out to the cats is relatable to the external constraints placed on Marlowe: as an undergraduate in the one instance, and a spy in government pay in the other. The image of the alternately petted and tormented cat is missing from the passage depicting the gathering of the Raleigh set. The absence of a feline analogue does not mean that the feline conceit is absent from this episode, but rather that it has subtilised itself. The subtilisation of the motif becomes apparent on comparing the marks of affection Hariot shows to Marlowe with the treatment Kett and Poley's cats receive.

The meeting of the Raleigh circle opens with Hariot confessing his perplexity at being moved by some lines from Faustus' climactic soliloquy on his impending damnation from Marlowe's play of the same name:

> —And yet, Thomas Hariot said, reason has its limitations. He stroked Kit's arm, for they were now friends, saying: Why should one line of poesy be better than another [p.156]?

What merits attention here is the depiction of Hariot stroking Marlowe's arm in the sentence connecting the two instances of direct speech. The motion underscores not only the stage of amity and intimacy their relationship has now reached but also the identification of Marlowe with a cat, insomuch as stroking is a typical token of affection given to a cat. The sentence has resonances of the briefing scenario as well, notably "Poley's stroking hand tightened" and "the cat [was] soon mollified with a gentle scratching beneath the chin." In the light of these echoes it becomes clear why the feline

analogue is absent here: it is no longer necessary because in this passage Marlowe *is* the cat.

In addition, the tightening of Poley's hold on the cat described is paralleled by "Hariot (...) gripped Kit's arm" [p.158]. Hariot's action accompanies and adds emphasis to the urgent recommendation he gives to Marlowe to "learn discretion," picking up and transmitting the tension generated by Raleigh's reproof. The parallel may be continued by relating the squeal of pain emitted by Poley's cat to Marlowe's stiff departure from the meeting to attend to his professional commitments. Like Poley's cat, he has been hurt, though morally rather than physically. The air of hurt pride with which he makes his exit is also revelatory of touchiness, a quality often attributed to cats, so that these parallels have the effect of characterising Marlowe as a feline.

The correspondences between Marlowe and Poley's cat serve to transfer the premonitory subtext of the provocation frame of the briefing to that of the debate. In the latter passage the sense of foreboding intimated by the cat in its role of analogue is brought out by the apophony of *Kit* with *Kett* in [8]. Taken literally, Hariot's utterance is merely an observation on Marlowe's grief at the death of his former tutor, but the phonological bond between their names points to other similarities between them that become apparent on close examination of the term *stroking*, present in both passages.

Returning to the clause "Poley's stroking hand tightened," the feature to note about it is the way that the verbal elements it contains conspire to present its grammatical subject as a source of both pain and pleasure. The verb phrase *tightened*, in conjunction with *squealed* in the following clause, conveys the idea of inflicting and suffering pain respectively, and is therefore balanced against the idea of pleasure suggested by the pre-modifying present participle *stroking*. In 5.3.2 the abrupt transition from the giving of pleasure to the infliction of pain is interpreted as a symbol of Poley's power to reward and punish. In addition to this, the co-occurrence of *tightened*, with its associations of pain, with *stroking* throws into relief the semantic overlap of its base form with *strike* on account of the synonymy of the noun *stroke* with *blow* as well as *caress*. The OED (1989: 907 XVI) registers the defunct collocation "to strike a stroke," as well as "to pass lightly over a surface" as one of the meanings of *strike*, echoing "to rub softly with the hand" (1978: 939), the acceptation of *stroke*. In the passage depicting the discussion, *stroke* occurs in the preterite form and with *Kit's arm* as its direct object, as opposed to the implied object of *stroking*, *the cat*. In the context of the parallels between Marlowe and Poley's cat, it is possible to assume the etymological meaning of the verb is

relevant in the Raleigh circle as well, triggered by the report of Kett's execution and the apophony of *Kit* with *Kett*.

The hand which strokes the cat can therefore easily be the one that strikes it. In like manner those, like Poley, who tolerate Marlowe's unconventionality in return for collaboration, will use their power to bring about his downfall the moment he has outlived his usefulness. His unconventionality consists, among other things, in consorting with the likes of Raleigh and his set to question, though not necessarily challenge, the orthodox view of Christ as God, an intellectual undertaking similar to the theology that has Kett burned as a heretic. The phonological link between *Kit* and *Kett* presages the martyr's fate, also insinuated by Poley, Marlowe will share with his tutor if he does not follow Hariot's advice of learning discretion. In this respect, the relation of apophony between the two names in excerpt [8] enacts the type-antitype relation that obtains between the philosopher's cat and Marlowe. Kett is burned at the stake for heresy; Marlowe is stabbed to death after being branded an atheist and blasphemer. In mourning his former tutor's death, then, Marlowe laments the death in store for him in the future.

5.4. Recapitulation

The phonological schemes contained in excerpts [6]-[10] have been considered principally as formal motifs, paired items which sporadically appear in the same co-text. As motifs these schemes operate at one level as cohesive ties, and at another as foregrounding devices. In their first capacity their function is basically that of linking passages together: the apophony of *Kit* with *cat* hooks up the tutorial to the briefing scenario while the apophony of *Kit* with *Kett* connects the passage depicting the tutorial to that representing the meeting of the Raleigh set. In their second capacity the schemes draw attention to the correspondences between the episodes described in the interconnected passages: each one depicts a colloquy in which Marlowe disregards the directives he receives and provokes his interlocutors to anger. Their joint repetition in three passages makes the directive and provocation frames components of a narrative motif which assists in the characterisation of Marlowe as an argumentative and heedless individual who is constantly antagonising those who have dealings with him.

Viewed as motifs, the co-occurrences of *Kit* with *cat* and *Kett*, in the different grammatical realisations they occur in, seemingly play a subsidiary role with respect to the narrative motif they draw attention to. Insofar as it is a vehicle through which

Marlowe's contumacy is revealed, the colloquy motif indicates the conflicting but related themes of transgression and vulnerability which pervade the three passages on account of the subject-matter of the colloquies which take place in them. These themes, however, are prefigured by the itinerancy of the philosopher's cat with which the Narrator's memoir opens, itinerancy being a trait shared with Marlowe, justifying his identification with cats in [1] subsequently transformed into errancy by the dramatist's unconventional behaviour. In the tutorial and briefing scenarios the framing metaphor of the wandering cat gives way to those of the struggling and maltreated cat, which, as a result of his feline characterisation, symbolises the circumstances that constrain the freedom of movement he so much cherishes.

The wandering cat, the struggling cat, the maltreated cat and the drowning cat are therefore variations of the feline conceit, the interpretive frame through which Marlowe is presented. The philosopher's cat frames the poet-spy by means of their common itinerancy, which subsequently symbolises the latter's errancy, progressively revealed by his unruly behaviour and outspoken expression of his unorthodox opinions. The other variants of the conceit reflect a steadily worsening situation: his unruliness causes Marlowe first to rebel against an intolerable state of affairs he is powerless to change, and then lose the favour of those who can help him, and finally bring about his own downfall.

6. The Framing of Deviance through the Feline Conceit

The tutorial episode, as seen in 5.1.1, ends in an angry scene sparked off by Marlowe's refusal to respond to Francis Kett's call to prayer. The tutor's last words to his unwilling disciple, "I know of your sins," have an unsettling effect on the latter, to judge by the stretch of free indirect thought that closes the passage:

> Did [Kett] know of his sins? Was that a sin that the Greeks approved, that was practised by the holy Socrates [p.7]?

The references to the Greeks and Socrates identify Marlowe's sin as that of having had sex with other men, or, in keeping with the parlance of early Modern England, having committed sodomy (Bray 1982: 14; 1990: 3; Smith 1991: 11). That male-male sexual union was not only tolerated but also condoned in Ancient Greece is a commonplace stemming from the homoerotic readings the Platonic dialogues are open to, particularly the *Symposium*, in which love is discussed mainly in terms of erotic attraction among males. Given the moral authority traditionally accorded to Socrates, signalled here by the epithet *holy*, Marlowe's second question challenges the Judaeo-Christian ethos he is born into, especially as regards its homophobia. Kett's admonitory "[y]ou are to be blasted, sir," later specified by Father Ballard's denunciation of sodomy as "a foul sin" for which "Holy Mother Church (…) ordains burning as Sodom was burned" [p.56-7], is indicative of the divine, and human, retribution awaiting men that make love with other men. Marlowe's critical stance against Christian morality, whether Protestant or Catholic, is ultimately traceable to his defiant avowal of his sexual orientation in the face of a moral discourse that writes off homosexual desire as an abomination which has no place in the divine scheme.

Marlowe's rejection of Judaeo-Christian Puritanism for what he believes to be a more enlightened Classicism adds a new dimension to the feline conceit which frames him. In the previous chapter the waywardness and vulnerability symbolised by his felinity is defined in behavioural and intellectual terms. On the one hand, there is Marlowe's scepticism with respect to traditional teachings, and on the other his indiscretion, or penchant for broadcasting his unorthodox views regardless of the susceptibilities of those whose values he questions. The relation of his nonconformity with his self-consciousness regarding his sexual orientation makes Marlowe as much a rebel in the sexual as the intellectual and religious sphere, in turn making his homosexuality another manifestation of his feline waywardness. Like transgression and vulnerability, homoeroticism is a theme indicated by means of the pairing of *Kit* with

items with which it shares formal correspondences. The schemes that will come under examination are the alliteration of the familiar name with *Kind* in

11. And yet it was Marston who in his innocence called him Kind Kit. He did not know him [p.3],

and what for want of a better term has been called eye-alliteration (see 3.1.2) between the name and *know* in the extract above and

12. I know little. I was but a small actor and smaller play-botcher who observed him intermittently though indeed knew him in a very palpable sense (the Holy Bible speaks or speaketh of such unlawful knowing) [p.3].

Despite the apparent randomness of the choice in extracts, in early Modern English both *Kind* and *know* are sometimes used in a distinctly bawdy sense, which in turn triggers the ribald meanings of *cat*, the absent term educed by *Kit* in both cases. These salacious meanings are most noticeable in

2. Cat or Kit I said, and indeed about Kit there was something of the cat,

triggered by the erotic subtext to the paragraph it introduces, and allowing the *Kit-cat* apophony in this excerpt to be re-examined in the light of the bawdy senses of *Kind* and *know*.

6.1. The Semantic Contagion of *Kind* by *Know*

The apophony of *Kit* with *cat* sets in train a process of semantic contagion whereby the name becomes, in the context of the novel, a synonym of the noun it is phonologically bound to. This relation of synonymy, as has become clear in the preceding analyses, results more from the transfer of the connotations carried by *cat* than its lexical meaning. By the same token the alliteration of *Kind* with *Kit* contributes to the semantic contagion of the name by the adjective. In this case the process is initiated by the status of the adjective as an epithet, indicated by the upper case, so that the construction identifies Marlowe not only by the name but also by the attribute described by the adjective qualifying it. The perception that kindness is integral to the bearer's character renders *Kit* and *kind* synonymous, with the result that the mention of the one term will automatically evoke the other.

The conversion of *Kit* into a byword for kindness runs counter to the rather negative feline associations it has picked up. The usual acceptation *kind* is used with is

> exhibiting a friendly or benevolent nature by one's conduct, having a gentle, sympathetic or benevolent nature (OED 1989: 438 VIII).

Gentleness, sympathy and benevolence do not sit well with the aloofness, contumacy and capriciousness conjured up by the name as a result of the semantic contagion by *cat* reviewed in the previous chapter. One way of resolving the contradiction is to put it down to conflicting perceptions of Marlowe, a resolution already suggested in the definition by the difference between *exhibiting* and *having*. Another is to assume *Kind* has undergone semantic contagion as well, with the consequence that the adjective acquires meanings that are more consistent with the overall impression of intractability created by the connotations enumerated above. The source of this contagion is the verb *know*, which occurs in the same co-text as *Kind Kit*, and which carries meanings acquired in the passage from which excerpt [12] is taken. This section will as a result fall into three parts: one devoted to an initial reading of *Kind Kit*, another to the polysemy of *know*, and a third to a second reading of the sobriquet in the light of the semantic contagion of *Kind* by *know*.

6.1.1. An Initial Reading of Kind Kit

Perhaps the first point to make here is that the sobriquet applied to Marlowe is a reported attribution of kindness. It is not the Narrator that calls him *Kind Kit*, but, presumably, fellow man of letters John Marston. Next, and more importantly, the phrasing of [11] gives to understand that the adjective is misapplied: either because of lack of discernment regarding Marlowe's true character, suggested by *in his innocence*; or non-acquaintance with him, suggested by [*h*]*e did not know him*. The dismissal of Marston's apparently adulatory sobriquet is indicative of the difficulty of assessing the recipient's character, a task which the Narrator undertakes to carry out in his memoir, in spite of the admission that his literary talents might not be up to such an enterprise implicit in "[i]t may be that plain English cannot encompass a life so various, tortured and contradictory" [p.3].

Looking at the description given of Marlowe in the paragraph introduced by extract [2], one has the impression that its purpose is to convince the reader of the inappropriacy of *Kind Kit*. After describing Marlowe's physical appearance, highlighting his feline characteristics, the portrait is completed by listing the personal habits that have gained him notoriety among his contemporaries, namely intemperance: "[h]e ate little but drunk much and vomited proportionally [p.4]; an addiction to

tobacco: “[h]e was given (…) to the rank tobacco of Barbados and filthy pipes that whistled and bubbled with brown juice;” and scant respect for institutionalised religion “[a]t first as at last he was a fair curser and ingenious in his blasphemies.” The narrative proper opens with Marlowe applying his caustic wit to the Christian faith for the mere pleasure of shocking his more orthodox-minded chamber fellows. His irreligious carping is interrupted by a violent altercation which has broken out outside a tavern opposite their college, and which he is eager to join in. Besides profane and sharp-tongued, he is rowdy and ready for a fight, disreputable character traits that make him the perfect subject of the tavern-brawl motif. As presented by the Narrator, then, Marlowe is not the amiable mild-mannered pastoral poet that writes of “shallow rivers to whose falls melodious birds sing madrigals” [p.3], but a coarse vituperative lout much given to violence.

In the light of this character study, seemingly corroborated by Marlowe’s cockiness in the three passages reviewed in Chapter Five, *Kind Kit* emerges an example of a malformed naming convention because it belies rather than reveals the turbulent character of its bearer. Conversely, because of its equivalence with *cat*, plain *Kit* is a more appropriate name. Marlowe’s tendency to be wounding may be described colloquially as *catty*, an adjective whose descriptive content draws more on the connotative than lexical meaning of the noun it is derived from. Malice and cruelty are qualities attributed to cats so that, in affirming that “about Kit there was something of the cat,” the negative associations evoked by felines are attached to Marlowe as well.

The inappropriacy of Marston’s sobriquet resides in the habitual acceptations of *kind* conveyed by the definition of the adjective given in the OED above. However, the adverbial prepositional phrase modifying *called* in [12] suggests the adjective may describe qualities other than amiability and gentleness which Marlowe might possess. If that is the case, Marston’s innocence may be said to consist in ignorance of the significance of *kind* as well as Marlowe’s character. In other words, the adjective does describe Marlowe adequately, but not in the sense in which Marston applies it. The covert meaning of *Kind* is triggered by *know*, to which the adjective, as well *Kit*, is linked orthographically. The verb in turn refers back to the earlier occurrences of *know* in [12], from the preceding paragraph, and in which it is used with different meanings than that which it conveys in [11]. It is these meanings that are responsible for bringing out the hidden, more appropriate descriptive content of the adjective. To see how they

bear on the semantic make-up of *Kind*, it is necessary to see first how *know* is affected by the earlier occurrences of the verb.

6.1.2. The Polysemy of Know

On viewing the excerpts together, one notices that the second clause of [11] echoes parts of [12]. Syntactically [*h*]*e did not know him* parallels *I know little* quite closely, although the verb differs in tense and meaning in each extract: 'be apprised of' as opposed to 'be familiar with.' The parallel with [*I*] *knew him in a very palpable sense* is even closer because both terms have the same tense and meaning, namely 'be familiar with,' although the former occurrence is used in an affirmation and the latter in a negation.

The contrast, in the second of the two parallelisms, between affirmation and negation has the effect of setting up an antithetical relationship between Marston and the Narrator based on acquaintance with Marlowe. The latter claims to have known the dramatist personally, an assertion reinforced by the adverbials *indeed* and *in a very palpable sense*, while explicitly denying any intimacy between his acquaintance and Marston. The claim of personal acquaintance enables the Narrator to arrogate to himself the authority to speak of Marlowe. The claim, however, is weakened in the concessive clause in the sentence qualifying the statement made in the preceding one: "though time is proving that dim eyes and dimmer wits confounded the periphery with the centre." What the Narrator knows of Marlowe is limited because his acquaintance with him is, as indicated by the relative clause *who observed him intermittently*, one marked by discontinuity occasioned by Marlowe's itinerancy. Despite its periodicity, the Narrator's alleged association with Marlowe gives him sufficient sanction to disallow Marston's bestowal of the sobriquet of *Kind Kit*.

Immediately after the concessive clause in [12] there is the parenthetical clause "the Holy Bible speaks or speaketh of such unlawful knowing." The reference to Scripture, the King James Bible to judge by the ironic doublet of *speaks* with the archaic *speaketh*, provides a gloss on *knew*, indicating that it is used in the biblical and legal sense of 'have sexual intercourse with' rather than 'be familiar with.' Further, the qualification *unlawful* stresses that it is coition involving males that is meant here, already inferable from the Narrator's description of himself as an actor and the masculine pronominal reference to Marlowe. The Narrator's authority to chronicle Marlowe's life rests on a confession that in his boyhood he had been the dramatist's occasional sexual partner.

The parallelism of [*I*] *knew him* with *He did not know him* facilitates the transfer of the sexual meaning of *knew* and *knowing* in [12] to *know* in [11]. Accordingly, the latter sentence may be read that Marston not only was not acquainted with Marlowe but also did not have sex with him. The semantic contagion undergone by *know* also affects other words present in the co-text. In the preceding sentence *innocence* takes on the meaning 'absence of sexual experience,' although in this context it describes the lack of intimacy existing between Marlowe and Marston rather than the latter's virginity. More importantly, the sexual meaning acquired by *know* brings out the bawdy connotations of *Kind* as well, so that the sobriquet it forms part of is revelatory of Marlowe's sexual identity.

6.1.3. A Second Reading of Kind Kit

In the erotic terminology of early Modern English *kind* is used with a number of bawdy meanings, of which two are of relevance to the feline characterisation of Marlowe. Partridge (1968 [1947]: 130) notes that the nominal co-homonym of the adjective is a constituent element of the idioms *be after kind* and *do the deed of kind*, defined respectively as "[t]o seek, sexually, one's mate" and "[t]o have sexual intercourse" (1968 [1947]: 95). Williams (1994: 769 II) indicates that the adjective *kind* is often used with the meaning 'sexually complaisant,' adding that the adjective is rarely applied to men on the strength that in heterosexual unions the female partner is traditionally assumed to yield to the advances of the male. In the light of these glosses, *Kind Kit* defines Marlowe as lecherous on the one hand, and effeminate on the other.

6.1.3.1. Kind *as an Allusion to Lechery*

To illustrate the entry *be after kind*, Partridge quotes the following couplet from Touchstone's indecent ditty in *As You Like It*:

> If the cat will after kind,
> So be sure will Rosalind
> (III.ii. 102-3).

Burgess, too, may have had these lines in mind when he has the Narrator say of Marlowe that he "blinked his green eyes much and evaded, *as cats will*, the straight gaze[22]" [p.4]. Design or coincidence, the image of the cat on heat to represent Rosalind's passion couples Marlowe's sexuality with his felinity.

[22] Emphasis added.

This elision of felinity into sexuality is clearly discernible in the feline description of Marlowe, whose starting point is a frank revelation of his sexual orientation:

> Even in the carnal act the eyes were not engaged, at least not often, and it may well be that the sodomitical seek to avoid ocular discourse as speaking too much of the (albeit temporary) union of hearts [p.4].

The feline associations attached to the mannerism of avoiding eye contact during sex brings out the lewd connotations of *cat*, just as the sexual meaning of *know* calls forth the bawdy meanings of *kind*. In early Modern English sexual imagery the cat epitomises lechery to such an extent that the term *cat* is used with a broad variety of prurient meanings, such as 'sexually active male,' 'prostitute' and 'pander,' as well as 'vulva' and 'penis' (Williams 1994: 214-5 I). The overall impression created by this semantic miscellany is one of debauchery without distinction of sexual role or gender: *cat* can refer to those who have sex as well as those who encourage it, or the female pudenda as well as the male sex organ. The identification of Marlowe with cats therefore brands him as a profligate and promiscuous individual, again a far cry from the "mellifluous poet" [p.244] Marston would have him be.

6.1.3.2. Kind *as an Allusion to Homosexuality*

While stressing lechery, Partridge's gloss on *be after kind* may be related to homoeroticism as well. The idiom admittedly presupposes heterosexuality in that its key term refers to a mate of the same species as, but of a different sex to, the subject experiencing sexual desire. As Partridge points out in the entry, *kind* is synonymous with *nature* so that the idiom emphasises the instinctual character of lusting after a mate. The synonymy of the two nouns, Partridge goes on to say, is overlaid by the erotic French literary euphemism *la nature* for the female pudenda, suggesting that what is natural is that the male should lust for the female. Applied to Marlowe, however, *kind* may be reinterpreted as a mate not only of the same species but of the same sex as well. In other words, to say that Marlowe "is after kind" is to say that he is seeking a male sexual partner.

Conservative sexual morality regards same-sex desire as indicative of the sexual inversion of the individual that experiences it, summed up, in the case of male homosexuality, in the formula *anima muliebris in corpore inclusa* (Sedgewick 1990: 87). On this interpretation Marlowe's sexual orientation would makes him *ipso facto* effeminate in that the erotic attraction men hold for him is natural to women, the

equation of male-male desire with effeminacy being inscribed in the name he is most frequently called by. Besides the familiar form of *Christopher*, *Kit* is the abbreviated form of *Catherine* (OED 1989: 466 VIII), although it is usually re-extended to *Kitty* when used as a female name (Pickering 2004 [1999]: 205). The possibility of using *Kit* as both a female and male name therefore makes it an emblem of its bearer's effeminacy. This is made patent by *Kitticat*, the teasing sobriquet by which Meg Marlowe calls her brother in excerpt [5]. The name can be broken down into *Kitty cat* so that the pet form of *Catherine* acts as a gender marker that indicates the female sex of the referent of the noun it modifies. In calling Marlowe *Kitticat*, Meg unconsciously feminises —or, as Levine (1986) and Orgel (1989) would have it, effeminises[23]— him as well as alludes to his vulnerability.

The imprint of androgyny its double source leaves on *Kit* conflates effeminacy into the connotations of promiscuity the name picks up through its apophony with *cat*, the bawdy meanings of which have been previously triggered by the salacious meaning of *kind*. According to Williams's gloss on the adjective (1994: 769 II), yielding to the advances of one's partner is assumed to be a typically female experience of sex. Passive docility is gendered as a feminine quality, a docility that degenerates into licentiousness when it becomes an indecorous readiness to accept propositions from many different men. Both the pet and familiar forms of *Catherine* are used as bywords for female promiscuity, *Kit* being defined as 'a light woman' (OED 1989: 466 VIII) and *Kitty* 'a woman of loose character' (OED 1989: 474 VIII). By means of this instance of multiple semantic contagion *Kit* brands Marlowe as sexually promiscuous in the traditionally feminine sense of being of easy virtue: hence the effeminising effect of the familiar.

In the light of the chain of semantic contagions brought about by the of the ribald meaning of *kind*, educed by its orthographical relation to *know*, Marston's sobriquet turns out to be appropriate after all. The diverse sexual meanings brought into play conspire to attribute not only lechery to Marlowe but also qualities deemed feminine by bringing to light his sexual orientation. Since the lechery the cat comes to symbolise by virtue of its formal relations with *kind* and *know* is framed in the same-sex relationship

[23] Neither Levine nor Orgel explain the nuance of meaning which separates *effeminise* and *effeminisation* from the more standard forms *feminise* and *feminisation*. As back-formations of the adjective *effeminate*, used disapprovingly to describe a man having or showing characteristics regarded as typical of women, one assumes that the coinings are meant to connote not so much the transformation as the degeneration of a man into a woman. Consequently, *effeminise* and *effeminisation* convey a negative evaluation of feminisation undergone by adult male humans absent from *feminise* and *feminisation*, a distinction which will be observed in this thesis.

hinted at in [12], the feline conceit becomes also a symbol of male homosexuality. And since eroticism among males is proscribed by prevalent sexual mores because it is deemed *contra natura*, Marlowe's sexual orientation becomes another example of his waywardness, the distinctive trait of his felinity. *Kind Kit*, then, describes him in terms of wantonness, exhibited by his sexual inclination.

6.2. Masculinity and Effeminacy in Male-Male Desire

To a certain extent the homophobic framing metaphor of the female soul trapped in a male body is implicit in the the feline conceit that frames Marlowe. In the lines Partridge (1968 [1947]: 130) cites from *As You Like It* the comparison between Rosalind and the cat effectively identifies the sex of the animal as female. Consequently, by equating the anxiousness with which the heroine of Shakespeare's comedy searches for Orlando to the urgency with which a cat on heat seeks a mate, it is female sexual desire that Touchstone specifically refers to. The cat as a symbol of female lust is borne out by the use of *Kate*, an alternative familiar form of *Catherine*, to refer to a feline desiring the male, and by extension the use of the pet form *Katy* as a synonym for *whore* (Williams 1994: 755 II). In any case *cat* is gendered feminine by default when it is not employed as an epicene noun, as evidenced by the pronominal references to *cat* in the following fragment from John Florio's translation of *An Apologie of Raymond Sebond*: "When I am playing with my cat, who knows whether she have more sport in dallying with me than I have in gaming with her?" (Montaigne's Essays, 1998). Although the generic application of the noun is as a rule indifferent to the sex of the specimens it designates, the use of feminine *she* and *her* instead of neuter *it* signals that the referents of *cat*, unlike those of *dog*, are assumed to be female unless indicated otherwise. The impression that, as Ballard would put it, "cattifying" Marlowe involves feminising him is strengthened by the phrasing of the Narrator's confession of their romantic attachment in [12]. The elided grammatical subject of *knew* refers to the Narrator while its direct object has Marlowe as its referent so that, when the verb is read with its sexual meaning, the impression is created that the former assumed the active male role in their relationship, and the latter the passive female one. However, as can be inferred by his bearing in the colloquy motif, Marlowe is generally portrayed in the novel as behaving in an assertive way which would strike the reader as masculine. This would suggest that his self is male instead of female, in flat contradiction to the *Haec Vir*, or she-man, explanation of male-male desire encouraged by the equation of felinity

with femininity (Munson Deats 1997: 15). Marlowe forces a re-examination of the she-man notion of male homosexuality that will result in a model capable of reconciling masculinity with erotic attraction among males.

6.2.1. The Effeminisation of Marlowe

The equation of felinity with femininity is made in the description of Marlowe's physical appearance introduced by excerpt [2], "about Kit there was something of the cat." To anyone acquainted with Elizabethan lyric poetry the description that follows will be recognised as a blazon, a literary convention whereby the poet-lover celebrates his mistress's beauty by detailing the various parts of her body (Cuddon 1979: 85). Starting with the recipient's "green eyes," the Narrator gives a full account of Marlowe's "feline face," with its "nose wide of nostril and chill and moist," "burning and thrustful" underlip, "long and Kentish" overlip, and the "abundant harvest" of his hair that look like "hayricks burning." In itemising the features of Marlowe's face, the Narrator casts himself into the active, masculine role of the lover who subjects his beloved to his gaze, and Marlowe in the passive, feminine role of the paramour who is the object of her suitor's gaze. The gaze imposed on Marlowe, albeit retrospectively, is the actualisation of the asymmetrical relation of power between the male lover and female beloved whereby he asserts his dominance over her by objectifying her. By the same token, the observation that Marlowe "evaded, as cats will, the straight gaze" signals feminine submission to the masculine claim to dominance, underscored by embedded explanatory clause, which serves as a reminder of the cat as symbol of feminine sexual complaisance. Thus, as Smith (1991: 229) notes, the Petrarchan tradition of singing the praises of the mistress's beauty is at bottom a means enabling men to confirm their power over women. As the object of the blazon in love poetry is invariably female, the resemblance of the Narrator's description to these versified inventories has the effect of effeminising Marlowe.

The process of effeminisation initiated by the blazon is reinforced by the subdued insistence on the paucity of body hair in the Narrator's physical description of Marlowe. The hair on the latter's upper lip is described as being "a matter more of whiskers than of true mustachio," an observation immediately followed up by "the beard scant also," together with the remark "that he never grew to hirsute manhood." This point is repeated a few lines further down, where the Narrator reports "but little hair" on Marlowe's naked body, and "the mane thin above the fairsized thursday." The absence

of body hair is a feature traditionally valued as womanly, with the result that the object of the Narrator's description is effeminised physically as well. This effeminising effect is rounded off with the reference to the smoothness of Marlowe's flesh, the fairness of his form, and the flatness of his belly. Like the absence of body hair, the features enumerated are qualities that conform to traditional ideas of feminine comeliness. The description of Marlowe's physical appearance is in keeping with the feminine role imposed on him by the blazon conceit.

To the effeminising effect of the physical description given of him one may also add the display of character traits thought of as typically female. Mention has already been made of the appropriateness of *catty* as a description of the malicious remarks it is Marlowe's wont to utter without prior provocation on the recipient's part. Cattiness, the gratuitous display of malice, is assumed to be a characteristically female form of verbal violence. Where he is perhaps most feminine, however, is during courtship. This is best seen in Marlowe's show of false modesty before acceding to Thomas Walsingham's request, on parting after their first meeting, that he dedicate a poem to him

> I am too bashful to give you the matching line [to *Where both deliberate, the love is slight*], but you may guess it. It ends with *at first sight* [p.35].

The lines in question are from Marlowe's *Hero and Leander*, specifically the epigrammatic couplet on the unpredictability and irresistability of sexual desire that the eponymous characters of the romance experience on seeing each other for the first time (I 175-6). As far as Marlowe is concerned, the rhetorical question inspired by Hero and Leander's romantic encounter, "Who euer lov'd, that lov'd not at first sight?", is applicable to his meeting with Walsingham. In the amorous context created by the literary references Marlowe's shyness is interpretable as coyness, the insincere holding off the suitor in courtship. Playing hard to get is the role the female is traditionally expected to play. Like the lady who receives her lover's suit, Marlowe knows he will yield to the desire Walsingham arouses in him, but that he must not give in too quickly. In love as well as in dissension Marlowe is apt to play the woman.

6.2.2. Marlowe's Masculinity

The blazon contains a glaring disparity that fosters the suspicion that Marlowe belies the femininity attributed to him. The absence of body hair contrasts starkly with "the fairsized thursday," that is to say, Marlowe's large penis. The contrast arises from the assumption that being well hung epitomises virility, which in turn highlights the more

forceful and unsentimental sexuality thought of as characteristically masculine. The casual reference to Marlowe's priapism, with its associations of machismo, would seem to warrant the reversal of the sexual roles the wording of [12] gives to understand. The association of potency with being well-endowed strongly suggests that in his relationship with the Narrator it is Marlowe that takes the dominant active role. The picture of feminine passivity and submissiveness implied by the absence of body hair and the possession of smooth skin is exploded by the reference to Marlowe's large penis, the most potent symbol of masculinity.

What is subsequently related of Marlowe's liaison with the Narrator bears out the connotations of masculine self-assertiveness carried by his "fairsized thursday." The priapic account given by the Narrator of his debauching by Marlowe leaves no doubt as to his lover's aggressiveness in matters of sex:

> And so he found me alone, conning the part of the Queen in *Hamlet-Revenge*, a half-finished play of Tom Kyd's (…) His eyes closed, muttering strange words and also groaning, he had me stripped and himself stripped and was soon at work that seemed strangely loveless [pp.35-6].

Marlowe's active, male role is enhanced by the effeminisation undergone by the Narrator on account the female part he is rehearsing when he is set upon, casting him in the role of the beloved, the passive recipient of the lover's attentions. As well as effeminising the Narrator, the term *Queen*, foregrounded by its alliteration with *conning*, throws into relief the purely physical nature of the encounter. The noun is the homophonous cognate of *quean*, an archaic synonym of *woman*, which through a process of pejorative change has come to mean 'loose woman.' The disparaging connotations of *Queen* not only downgrades the Narrator to a mere sex object, it also foregrounds Marlowe's urge to satisfy his desire regardless of the needs of his partner. This selfish insistence on instant gratification is again regarded as typical of the unromantic male attitude towards sex.

The Narrator transfers the trauma caused by the rape he endured to his reading of *Tamburlaine*, the first of his ravisher's stage plays to be performed:

> I say lust and lust again. It was all Kit lusting, a male body augmented to a world his prey and no retribution [p.120].

The appositive clause in the second sentence provides a brutal gloss on male-female unions as represented in the Petrarchan tradition to which the blazon belongs (Cuddon 1979: 85). The dominance of the male over the female insinuated by the poet's roving

gaze on his mistress's static body is brought into stark relief by the image of copulating bodies. The post-modification of *a world*, implicitly gendered female, evokes the feline conceit insomuch as *prey* evokes rapacity, identified as one of the many attributes that cats are assumed to possess, though a masculine one. However, because of the explicit gendering of the body Marlowe is likened to as male, felinity in this context is equated with masculinity instead of femininity. Sexually, Marlowe is a predator that stalks, then pursues and finally possesses his victim, as the Narrator himself knows only too well. The cat as a predator symbolises the masculine sexual violence Marlowe is prone to, a far cry from the feminine complaisance initially evoked by *Kind Kit*.

In the final analysis, then, the only trait that Marlowe displays describable as feminine is his sexual desire for other males. In making him the object of his blazon, the Narrator retrospectively reverses the roles they each played while their association lasted. The Narrator does not know Marlowe, as he claims in [12]; rather, it is Marlowe that knows him. In this respect the memoir pursues a similar end to that the Petrarchan poets work for. The idealisation of the lady, as Smith (1991: 229) indicates, is the means by which the poet-lover seeks to defuse the sexual desire she arouses in him and deprive it of its power to overwhelm him. By idealising her, the poet makes his beloved unattainable, making it easier for him to keep his desire for her at bay. By placing a long temporal distance between them, the Narrator makes equally Marlowe unattainable, making it easier for him to come to terms with his sexual subjection to the dramatist who took both him and the London playhouse by storm.

6.2.3. The Dissociation of Male-Male Desire from Effeminacy

The Narrator's revelation of his relationship with Marlowe bears testimony to Munson Deats's assessment of the biographical Christopher Marlowe as "the most masculine of poets" (1997: 225). Marlowe's masculinity accordingly shows up the facile equation of male-male sexual desire with effeminacy as more a distortion than an explanation of male homosexuality. If a male whose object of desire are other males need not be a she-man, a female under male form, then the notion of male homosexuality needs to be revised so that it may assimilate Marlowe's sexual orientation into maleness. The task of finding an alternative to the she-man model is one Marlowe himself undertakes. Driven by the climate of homophobia in which he must come to terms with his sexuality, he turns to Classical Antiquity for more homophilic rationalisations of why, as he confesses, "I am drawn to my own sex" [p.57], particularly to the subtly eroticised

male friendships discoursed on in Plato's dialogues. Marlowe's stand on male sexuality is therefore describable as highly homoeroticised Neo-Platonism.

The homoerotic alliances spoken of in the Platonic dialogues constitute an instance of the gender-separatist model of male homosexuality proposed by Sedgwick (1990: 87-9). The underlying assumption of this model is that it is natural for individuals of the same sex to bond together because they have more in common with one another than with members of the opposite sex, and that sexual attraction plays an important role in such bonding. This view controverts the presupposition that underpins the she-man model of male homosexuality. The notion that the man drawn to his own sex is a female self trapped in a male body is firmly based on the belief in the cross-sex nature of erotic desire: the male is naturally drawn to the female and vice versa. Further, as Sedgwick points out (1990: 87), the she-man model of male homosexuality confirms the heterosexual nature of sexual desire insomuch as the feelings the male homosexual has for another male is at bottom a manifestation of the desire of a female self. In preserving the cross-sex view of sexual desire, the she-man model also upholds the gender distinctions built on this perspective which structure patriarchal society.

As regards male homosexuality, gender separatism has two corollaries. The first is that male-male unions are the epitome rather than the denial of masculinity. The second corollary, which follows on from the first, is that it is cross-sex desire that effeminises males. In this gender separaticism coincides with the male suspicion of sexual passion which informs the Petrarchan tradition of love poetry. The poet-lover's attempt to bring his desire under control through the idealisation of his beloved is a means of avoiding the trouble of persuading her to accept his suit. Courtship is characterised by a show of procrastination on the part of the lady, largely because it takes her considerably longer to become sexually aroused (Barbour 1995: 1007). By alternately encouraging and discouraging her lover's advances, she puts off surrendering herself to him until she is ready to do so, obliging him to give up masculine directness for feminine delay. The lover's desire for his lady paradoxically renders him effeminate because he is forced to keep step with the dilatory pace of the female, despite his eagerness for a speedier resolution (Orgel 1989: 14-5; Smith 1991: 38; Barbour 1995: 1010). Male-male relationships therefore counter the threat of effeminisation posed by heterosexual desire. As regards the gender separatism embodied by Platonic homoeroticism, male-male unions are not only a means of preserving masculinity but also the acme of human relationships, a view that underpins Marlowe's advocacy of his sexual identity.

6.2.4. The Platonic Rationale for Male Homosexuality

Marlowe is reported as having two long-term romantic attachments: his involvement with the Narrator, and his love affair with Thomas Walsingham. The amorous triangle they form is at variance with the connotations of promiscuity which adhere to *Kit* on account of the semantic contagion of the sexual meanings of *cat* and *kind*. Apart from the occasional reference to the odd encounter with boy prostitutes, Marlowe is more or less constant in his affections, though still guilty of two-timing. Although both the liaisons he is engaged in are same-sex ones, they differ from one another due to the difference in the respective ages of his partners. Whereas Walsingham is described as "a young man of Kit's own age" [p.31] when he is introduced, the Narrator is a boy-actor when he "saw Kit for the first time" [p.15]. Each relationship corresponds to two of the three types of male-male unions Smith (1991: 75-6) identifies, namely age-graded relations in the case of Marlowe's romance with the Narrator, and egalitarian homosexuality in the case of his affair with Walsingham. Each of the two types of liaison Marlowe is involved in are moreover rationalised by associating them with Platonic models of male bonding.

6.2.4.1. *Marlowe's Age-Graded Male-Male Union*

The age-graded relation Marlowe has with the Narrator, initiated by the rape described in 6.2.2, is strongly reminiscent of the paederastic unions of fifth-century Athens. The Narrator is a pre-pubescent boy when he is sexually assaulted by a Marlowe who has just come of age, and their association lasts until early adolescence. In Classical Athens paederastry is inextricably linked to education (Sedgewick 1985: 4), a connection that is made most explicitly in the opening speech of Plato's *Symposium*. There Phaedrus asserts that "it's absolutely right to gratify a lover in the hope of gaining virtue (…) because it forces the lover to pay attention to his own virtue and the boyfriend to do the same" (1999: 17)[24]. An age-graded relation is not just a matter of the older man taking his pleasure with the adolescent he takes a fancy to: in return he must give the youth an ethical education that will prepare him for the passage into adult life and the social responsibilities that go with manhood. It is as much a matter of the older man taking the adolescent under his wing as taking a fancy to him. As a concomitant of his intellectual and ethical development, then, paederastry is integral to the initiation of the youth into manhood (Smith 1991: 168). The ultimate aim of such unions is make an upright citizen

[24] Christopher Gill's translation.

of the adolescent, a nice indication of how male-male desire can be used to uphold the male power structure (Smith 1991: 169).

On close inspection, however, the Narrator's relationship to Marlowe does not stand comparison to the sexual communion between the men and boys of the Athenian patrician class. Marlowe and the Narrator may be regarded as belonging to the same social class in that they are both members of the playhouse fraternity when the former comes down from Cambridge. Also, the Narrator may be said to be following in Marlowe's footsteps when he gives up acting for play-making. But the similarities stop here. Marlowe cannot be said to initiate the Narrator into the secrets of writing a play because in no part of the narrative is there any mention of the former having taught the latter the tricks of the playwright's trade. Their liaison consequently lacks the reciprocity which is understood to underpin age-graded unions. Marlowe satisfies the desire the Narrator arouses in him but neglects his duty to oversee the education of the object of his desire.

6.2.4.2. *Marlowe's Egalitarian Male-Male Union*

Although no explicit reference is made, the *Symposium* bulks large in the passage in which Marlowe meets, and falls in love with, Walsingham. The first allusion to the dialogue is Marlowe's mention of "the prenatal collocation of souls" [p.33] in reply to Walsingham's seemingly causal remark that they "must have met before." More concretely, the allusion is to Aristophanes' creation myth recounted in the *Symposium* to explain the origin of sexual desire for a specific person (1999: 22-7), which is recognised and followed by a brief rundown:

> —Does [Plato] not also tell some legend of a unity capriciously split by the gods, so that half goes wandering in search of half? But that is a pretty doctrine of male soul and female soul conjoined if they are lucky, which is rare, after an eternity of seeking [p.33].

That is to say: in the beginning human beings were conjoined twins who had become separated, and the two halves have been searching for each other ever since to restore their pristine unity, mutual erotic attraction being the sign that their search is at an end. Walsingham's imperfect rehearsal of the myth is completed with

> —Male and female are grossly conjoined following natures's will that they breed. There is an airier and more spiritual mode of conjunction,

an amplification which implies that the sundered twins are not invariably of either sex. The myth, in other words, would account for both homosexual and heterosexual desire.

Homosexual love reunites twins of the same sex while heterosexual love involves the reunion of a male with a female twin.

Marlowe's correction contrasts both types of love in the context of Platonic realism, a contrast that privileges male-male over male-female desire. The adjectives *airier* and *more spiritual* elevate male homoeroticism to the rarefied world of ideas while *grossly conjoined* consigns heterosexuality to the imperfect world of the senses. As implied in the participal clause after the latter adjective phrase, male-male love is not geared towards procreation, a natural imperative which keeps the soul earthbound, and therefore an encumbrance which stops it from rising to the abode of the Forms. The idea that male-male love gives impetus to the soul's ascent is stated a little more explicitly when Marlowe answers Walsingham's objection that he is "anatomising unnatural love:"

> But what makes man what he is is unnatural if we raise him as we must above eating, dunging, begetting, dying.

The rationale Marlowe evolves for his justification of homosexual love is that the impossibility of producing offspring places it above, not beyond, the natural order and its laws.

Marlowe's defence of male homosexuality is a homoerotic version of Neo-Platonism, the prevailing philosophy of sixteenth-century Europe. From Plato it borrows, first, the division of the universe into a world of eternal and unchanging Forms, or universals, and a contingent and ever-changing sensible world that is an imperfect imitation of the former; and second, the notion of an upwardly mobile psyche that seeks to rise above the imperfections the sensible world and enter the world of Forms. In its ascent from the sensual to the ideal the soul is driven by its love of beauty, starting with the beauty of the human body, then progressing to the beauty of good and the beauty of ideas, and finally reaching absolute beauty, which in the Christianised version of Plato's thought is identified with God. The belief that love is the force that impels the ascension of the soul is the animating principle behind the Petrarchan tradition of poetry, which sacralises human love by divesting it of all sensuality which might distract the poet-lover from his quest for perfection. Accordingly, the contemplation of the physical beauty of the beloved, enacted in the blazon, is not a prelude to the consummation of sexual desire, but rather the means through which the poet passes from the realm of the material to the intellectual, and from there to the

spiritual domain. Petrarch an love poetry is the literary expression of Neo-Platonism in that it is a means of assisting the human soul in its effort to reach out towards perfection (Tillyard 1943: 33).

Besides its focus on male relationships, Marlowe's homoerotic version of Renaissance Neo-Platonism differs sharply from its model in the premium it places on genital sex. The guarded reference to homosexual sex expressed in "an airier and more spiritual mode of conjunction" prompts the ironic demand for elucidation: "More spiritual? Angels holding hands?" The answer to Walsingham's request is a little more explicit:

> —Holding hands, yes. Effecting more intimate joining. We have bodies, we are not all soul. There is a higher order than what crass nature dictates. Nature does not want poetry, nor the eyes of the seeker looking upward from the dungy earth. Nature does not want the love that she would call sterility but we could designate otherwise.

The main thrust of Marlowe's argument is that sexual union between men, unlike that between man and woman, is the point of departure for the soul's upward journey to the spiritual domain. Orthodox Neoplatonism sees the denial of heterosexual desire as what enables a man to transcend the sensual world; Marlowe's re-interpretation of the Neoplatonic view of love prescribes the satisfaction of homosexual desire so as to be raised from "the dungy earth." Carnal love between men entails the continuity between the sexual and the spiritual (Smith 1991: 39), in contrast to love between man and woman, which presupposes the distinction between the sexual and the spiritual.

6.2.5. Misogynistic Implications of Marlowe's Homosexuality

The rationalisations for the two relationships Marlowe is engaged in inherit the little store the Ancients set for the capabilities of women. Male-male unions are between equals or, in the case of age-graded relations, are conducive to the intellectual and moral development of the younger partner of the relationship. Equality can only exist between rational partners, and, according to the prevalent view in the Ancient world, reason is a faculty possessed only by men. The supposed irrationality of women would explain why sexual communion between male and female does not result in the ascent of the soul: the relationship between man and woman is one of non-equals. Marlowe puts it more bluntly when he confides to the Narrator his intention of flouting "the bestial law of breeding" [p.142]. Procreative intercourse is "bestial" in that it is an activity that humans share with brute beasts, creatures devoid of human reason. Procreative intercourse, moreover, necessarily involves the concourse of male and female,

identifying women, relegated to brute beasts on account of their common irrationality, an impediment that stops men from rising from the material world.

Marlowe's misogyny comes to the fore the moment he discloses his sexual orientation to his mentor, Thomas Watson. After reading a translation of Ovid's Fifth Elegy by Marlowe, Watson commends a judicious choice of phrase:

> —I like the *breasts prest*. A rhyme confirming that there are two of them. You are a lover of breasts?
>
> —The swinging udders I was nursed at? I am given otherwise but here I am but the English voice of Ovid [p.10].

For Marlowe a woman's breasts are for suckling, not for being fondled. The dysphemistic substitution of *udders* for *breasts* diminishes the stature of women by equating them with animals, alluding thereby to their bestiality, the irrationality they share with brute beasts. From the very outset Marlowe's homosexuality is bound up with misogyny.

Marlowe's demeaning remark disparages women above all as sexual partners. His sexual inclinations disclosed, the conversation turns briefly on the merits of male-male love. Watson, who asserts his heterosexuality with the statement that he follows "nature up to the point where nature says *breed*," finds the idea of grown men making love with other grotesque — "[t]here is something absurd about grown men rubbing their beards together and untrussing"— while admitting that boys have sexual allure. Boys, he has heard tell, are prized for "their delectability and amenability," their ability "to arouse." Marlowe endorses Watson's pedantic description of the joys of paederasty in the course of his drunken and clumsy flirting with the Narrator:

> Then, grinning like a fool, he stroked my unfeeding hand, which was to his right. It is not so, you luscious Bel-Imperia that was, nay you are better as you are, women are but machines for breeding, boys are perfection [p.25].

As sexual partners boys are far superior to women, their superiority driven home by the observation that sex with women is for procreation, not for pleasure. Their ineluctable association with procreation renders women imperfect because it is what binds their male partners to "the bestial law of breeding," in contrast to paederastry, free from Nature's injunction to breed.

Marlowe's aversion to women is the gender-separatist model of male homosexuality taken to its masculinist extreme. Questioned on his preference for boys, he answers that paederasty offers a means for men to escape from women, who are to be loved "best

from afar" [p.142]. Women simply have no place in the ideal world of male self-sufficiency he hankers for. The exclusion of the female presence from the male paradise he is seeking definitively puts paid to the identification of male-male desire with effeminacy. The attraction Marlowe feels for his own sex does not signify his affinity with women but his complete alienation from them.

6.3. The Collapsing of Homoeroticism into Heterodoxy

Marlowe's homosexuality, as Chedgzoy (2004: 245) says of Christopher Marlowe's dramatisations of sexual encounters, is "entangled in the political structures and everyday practices of [the] social world" inferred from Burgess's fictional recreation of early Modern England. In relation to male-male desire, the society which emerges from *A Dead Man in Deptford* is a rigidly gender-segregated patriarchy, that is, it is a society ruled by men for men in which men and women inhabit separate social spaces. As regards male-male desire, patriarchal power either denies it, the she-man model of male homosexuality being one form of denial, or acknowledges it. In the case of acknowledgement the response has been either to assimilate male-male desire into the existing power structure or to proscribe it as a threat to the social order (Smith 1991: 171). In the case of early Modern England, however, the homophilic and homophobic responses co-exist in a "highly conflicted but intensively structured combination" (Sedgwick 1985: 25). The contradictory response to male-male desire is traceable to the fracture running through Renaissance culture deriving from "fifteen hundred years of blending of the classical and Christian traditions" (Rivers 1994 [1979]: 1). Whereas the prevailing moral discourse of the period, based on the Scriptures, is unequivocally homophobic, literary discourse, closely modelled on classical authors, opens avenues for the exploration of expressions of love departing from the procreative heterosexuality prescribed by the Biblical tradition, including sexual passion among males (Smith 1991: 17). The split authority which defines Renaissance culture in relation to male homosexuality is made patent by the common application of *holy* in "the Holy Bible" [p.3] and "holy Socrates" [p.7], to claim the incontestability of the teachings given by the moral arbiters the epithet is applied to. Marlowe's sexual self-consciousness places him in the very divide created by the homophobic and homophilic tensions underlying early Modern culture. His rationalisations of his sexual orientation, solidified by the markedly homoerotic subtexts to the literary lore of classical Antiquity, set him up

against the dominant moral discourse of his day, a sexual and intellectual opposition in part sustained by his poetic calling.

6.3.1. The Rebellion against the Divine Injunction to Procreate

At the heart of Marlowe's prejudice against the female sex is the abhorrence in which he holds procreation. As seen in the conclusion to 6.2.4.2, procreative sex is what ties man to the beasts, frustrating his intellectual and spiritual fulfilment. Marlowe evolves a conspiracy theory according to which God has hatched a plot to prevent the spiritual realisation of His creation:

> The scriptures had a lone Adam before that unhandy work with his rib, but what man could doubt that there had been a nameless companion for him expunged by God's multiplicitous children to be tormented or saved according to his caprice, hence the machine or miraculous contrivance of procreation, which pretended love, love being there but a trick [p.63]?

The jaded re-telling of the creation myth recounted in Genesis acts as a homophobic foil to the myth about the origin of sexual desire Walsingham recalls. The Garden of Eden was inhabited by Adam and a male mate until the latter was replaced by Eve. Heterosexual love is accordingly offered as a sop to Adam to help him forget the more fulfilling sexual union he had previously enjoyed with his former companion. Eve is still stigmatised as the agent that caused Adam's expulsion from Paradise, not because she induced him to eat the forbidden fruit, but because with her intrusion Paradise has ceased to be Paradise.

Marlowe's quarrel with the philoprogenitive designs of God brings him into conflict with the teachings of the Church, of whatever denomination. The disagreement comes to a head when at Rheims, under guise of a student undergoing a spiritual crisis, is heard in confession by Father Ballard. In many respects the confession episode is a rendering of the colloquy motif reviewed in the previous chapter in that it plays out the emotion scenario represented in the tutorial, debate and briefing episodes. Marlowe's admission that he has committed fornication "with boys and with men" draws the following reproof:

> That is a foul sin since it is against nature. We have not merely the condemnation of Holy Mother Church herself, which ordains burning as Sodom was burned, but the prohibition of reason, since the male seed is for purposes of generation [pp.56-7].

Ballard's request that he should give up a sin as "unnatural, iniquitous and beastly" are lost on his confessor, whose defiant stand on homosexuality is describable as gay in the

Present-Day use of the term to define oneself in terms of one's same-sex choice of sexual object (Sedgewick 1990: 16-17). Marlowe's perseverance in his homosexuality and disregard of the pleas to repent, reminiscent of his resistance to the calls to discretion, eventually cause the priest to give him up as a "lost soul" who "must needs be damned." Like Francis Kett, Ballard defers the retribution in store for Marlowe because of his obstinacy by leaving to God the burning ordained for sodomites.

6.3.2. Homosexuality and Blasphemy

The confrontation in the confessional is also between two different views of male homosexuality. Marlowe, as suggested in 6.3.1, shows an anachronistic, post-Freudian awareness of his sexual identity. The assertion "I was born so," in reference to "I am drawn to my own sex," reveals that he defines himself in terms of his choice of sexual object. Ballard's retort that "[n]o man is born so," by contrast, reduces male-male desire to "prohibited and isolated genital acts" (Sedgwick 1990: 83). Anal intercourse, what Ballard terms sodomy, is not an act which identifies the individual who indulges in it as a member of minority, but an aberration all men are prone to on account of the their innate depravity resulting from the Fall (Bray 1982: 16-17; Dollimore 1991: 238). It is this belief that sodomy is an unnatural act which man's corrupt nature impels him to that prompts Ballard to urge repentance: by asking God to grant him the strength to resist the the temptation to commit sodomy, Marlowe may overcome his desire to have sex with other males. The universalisation of sodomy nevertheless constitutes a denial of male homosexuality as much as the metaphor of the effeminised man does: there are no homosexuals, only depraved men who give in to the inclination to commit unnatural acts.

To counter the denial of male homosexuality by its relegation to a sin any man can commit, Marlowe re-interprets the relationship between Jesus Christ and his Apostles in the light of the pedagogical-paederastic unions explored in the *Symposium*. Lectured on the heinousness of sodomy, Marlowe replies that "my condition is condoned by Christ's own love of the beloved disciple" [p.57], a justification based on the homoerotic reading of "[n]ow there was leaning on Jesus' bosom one of the disciples, whom Jesus loved" (John 13: 22), and the "disciple (...) whom he loved." (John 19: 26)[25]. The disciple referred to is identified with John the Apostle, often conflated with St John the Evangelist, and is traditionally represented in religious art as a beardless young man, the

[25] Unless stated otherwise all quotes from the Scripture are from the King James Bible.

conventional figure of the Student. His youth, his discipleship, and Christ's supposed predilection for him all combine to equate their relationship to the paederastic liaisons epitomised by Socrates and Alcibiades. Like Socrates Christ is revered as a revolutionary moral teacher who preached an ethical outlook based on love, and who was put to death because of the radical nature of what he taught. The twist that Marlowe gives to the parallel is that the love both Christ and Socrates speak of is the erotic attraction one man has for another.

The assimilation of the homoerotic male friendships of fifth-century Athens into Christ's relationship with his twelve disciples conflates sexual into intellectual deviance. The locus of this fusion is *know*, the term *Kit* is orthographically bound to and which, as argued in 6.1.2, signifies 'have sex' on account of the allusion to anal intercourse by the phrase *unlawful knowing* in [12]. Despite the salience of its Biblical meaning, the primary meaning of the verb, 'have information gained from experience or learning,' is also relevant in view of Marlowe's application of his erudition to vindicate his proscribed sexual inclinations. In this sense his knowing is unlawful because it is used to defend sexual practices written off as indefensible. The terms with which Ballard dismisses Christ's love affair with John the Apostle lends support to the impression that Marlowe wilfully misapplies his knowledge of the Classics. Besides "foul blasphemy," Marlowe's contention shows "sulphurous ignorance (...) confusing *eros* and *agape*." As a clear allusion to the brimstone and fire which "rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah" (Genesis 19: 24), the adjective *sulphurous* serves to disambiguate *ignorance*. Thus modified, the noun does not refer to Marlowe's philological ineptitude in failing to distinguish love in the sense of sexual passion, *eros*, from love in the sense of goodwill for all humankind, *agape*. Rather, *ignorance* refers to the exploitation of the gaps in the English vocabulary for the various types of love lexicalised in demotic Greek, the language the New Testament was originally written in. Marlowe, Ballard gives to understand, knows only too well what type of love is meant, but takes advantage of the lexical gap to traduce the passages he alludes to, committing a blasphemy all the more unforgivable because of its deviousness.

6.3.3. Homosexuality and Atheism

Besides blasphemy, Marlowe's defence of "my condition" brings down on him the charge of atheism. To Ballard's "you must needs be damned" the confessor replies by questioning the existence of hell, a reply immediately put down with the cautionary

"[t]hen you commit yourself to atheism and what sins you will." The loaded question "[a]nd if I say that damnation itself is a lie?" tends to the contention that "hell's a fable," a piece of Faustian bravado primed by the allusion to the soliloquy beginning "Now, Faustus, thou must needs be damned?" (*Dr Faustus* I v 1-14)[26] contained in Ballard's admonition. The notion of a vengeful God who punishes those who transgress his laws with eternal torment after death is a human fiction cynically appropriated by the ruling elite and propagated to advance their power and silence dissent (Whitfield White 2004: 71). Marlowe, then, is an atheist in the sense that he holds a cynical view of religion, commonly associated with education and verbal agility (Hunter 1984: 141), and therefore evidence of relevance of both the primary and sexual meanings of *know* in relation to him. A cynical view of religion does not necessarily mean a disbelief in the existence of God, the Present-Day acceptation of *atheism*, if the cynicism applies to institutional religion only. Nevertheless, doubts on the sincerity of ecclesiastical authority can lead to doubts regarding the articles of faith they profess, which in turn can lead to a denial of the existence of an all-knowing, all-powerful and benevolent deity. Religious cynicism, in other words, begins with scepticism of the Church as an institution, and then becomes scepticism of the very notion of a personal God, and finally outright incredulity. Given his sexual orientation, Marlowe has every reason to challenge the homophobic strictures of the Christian faith by reviewing the Scriptures in a more homophilic light, an undertaking which inevitably exposes him to accusations of godless irreverence.

The interpretation of Christ's love for John the Apostle as *eros* instead of *agape* provides an illustration of how errant sexuality leads first to blasphemy, and then to atheism understood as religious scepticism. The homoerotic reading of their relationship as a plea for a more tolerant view of male homosexuality is liable to be taken as a means of weakening religious belief by discrediting the central figure of Christianity. The idea of the homosexual representation of Christ as a platform for atheism crops up towards the end of Part One of *A Dead Man in Deptford*. While on a mission to Flushing, Richard Baines, Marlowe's contact there and later his shadow, engages him in a conversation on holy Scripture, the conversation touching on the topic of the "beloved disciple:"

[26] Unless stated otherwise all references to Christopher Marlowe's plays are to J.B. Steane's 1969 edition.

—I think on [Christ] and the beloved disciple John and ask why he must like better one than the eleven others.

—A man may have a particular friend, it is in nature.

—Did they then lie together?

—Christ was a man. A man may perform the act of Sodom. Ergo Christ may have done this and thought it no shame [p.109].

Although Marlowe's facile syllogism sidesteps a blasphemous attribution of homosexuality, it can none the less be counted as atheistic. The premise "Christ was a man" can be construed as a denial of his divinity in that official dogma has it that Christ is the human incarnation of God. Worse still, the conclusion entertains the possibility that Christ sinned, although Marlowe does not speak of the *sin* of Sodom, the euphemistic circumlocution for anal sex. This is interpretable as an attribution of original sin to Christ insomuch as sodomy is a sin any man can commit on account of his fallen nature, again constituting a denial of his divine nature. Although Marlowe does not positively affirm Christ's homosexuality, he implicitly denies his divinity, a denial which has Kett burned at the stake.

Despite his circumspection, Marlowe's answers are traduced and included in the compilation of heresies Baines submits to the Privy Council, namely "[t]hat St John the Evangelist (...) leaned alwaies in his bosome, that he vsed him as the sinners of Sodoma" (quoted in Steane 1964: 364). The government informer is depicted as handing in his note just after Marlowe's appearance before the Council to answer the allegations of heresy made against him, and reading out choice *obiter dicta* concerning Christ attributed to the respondent, precipitating his downfall[27] [pp.246-7].

6.3.4. Homosexuality and Sorcery

The enumeration of the connotations carried by *cat* in the introduction to 4.3 includes associations of witchcraft. In Part Two of the novel Marlowe is suspected of having necromantic powers so that the feline conceit which frames him picks up these associations and relates them to his homosexuality, blasphemy and atheism.

The first inkling of the connection of homosexuality with witchcraft comes at the end of the blazon the Narrator devotes to Marlowe's body. The reference to the "fairsized thursday," the testimonial to Marlowe's misdirected virility, is followed by the assurance that the he did not bear "a supernumary nipple," a statement which makes

[27] The twelfth item of the Baines note quoted is not mentioned in the enumeration given in the novel, but the interrogation Baines subjects Marlowe to on Christ's supposed fancy for John the Evangelist is a transparent allusion for those familiar with the libel.

sense only against the background of the superstitions of the early Modern period. To bear more than two nipples is, according to the demonologists of the period, one of the distinguishing features of a witch, its purpose being that of secreting milk for the familiar spirit attending him or her (Summers 1994 [1925]: 75-6). The Narrator's denial presupposes the existence of allegations to the effect that Marlowe was a sorcerer, or more specifically a necromancer, to judge by the mass hysteria caused by the stage presentations of his *Doctor Faustus*:

> Christopher or Kit was known about the town, pointed at as one that could raise the devil with Latin, and with Greek call back Helen of Troy from the dead, and his frequent knocking at Durham House was noted and speculation raised about what devils were to be conjured up in the turret study whence black fumes floated [p.156].

These allegations are underwritten by the popular belief that the cat, the animal Marlowe is identified with, is one of the animal forms assumed by a familiar spirit, the demon that assists the witch. The upshot of the Narrator's tacit dismissal of the accusations of witchcraft levelled against Marlowe is, ironically, to burden the feline conceit with occult associations along with the sexual ones, which are also inhered in *Kit* through its phonological relation with *cat*.

The allusions to sorcery and lubricity at the end of blazon effectively collaspe the two into one another, again assisted by the feline conceit which pervades the physical description. The multiple, and often conflicting, bawdy meanings of *cat* mentioned in 6.1.3.1, and transferred via apophony to *Kit*, conjure up the scenario of sexual abandon and unbridled licence which bulks large in the denunciations of witchcraft made by theologians and demonologists. A witches' sabbath is envisaged as an orgiastic gathering in which the participants indulge in all manner of unhallowed sexual practices (Summers 1994 [1925]: 129). The wholesale debauchery that is said to go on in these assemblies culminates in the *osculum infame*, the reverential kiss on the buttocks given to the presiding demon (Summers 1994 [1925]: 137-8), an act of homage with vaguely sodomitical undertones in that it centres on the very site of homosexual desire.

Underlying this picture of communal sexual depravity is the assumption that an inordinate sexual appetite increases the likelihood of becoming a convert of the Devil's cause. In the Epistle to the Galatians, for instance, St Paul recites a litany of deadly sins and traces them to a the desire to gratify one's carnal lusts:

> Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness; idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies; envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like: of

> the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in times past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God (5: 19-21).

A careful reading of the Apostle's catalogue reveals a progression from the first set of sins to the third: sexual misdemeanours lead the offender to hold erroneous opinions, which in turn is the cause of disorderly conduct. Marlowe's sexual orientation accordingly leads him first to subject Platonic love to an overly sensual reading, then apply it to the Christian notion of charity, and finally indulge in dissolute behaviour. Sin, the sum of the transgressions listed in the quotation, is the force that constantly threatens the created order with dissolution (Tillyard 1943: 20), and unrestrained sensuality is identified as its mainspring.

6.3.5. Male-Male Desire as a Threat to the Established Order

In the course of the present section male-male desire is associated with blasphemy, atheism and sorcery. The triple association chimes in with the identification of religious with sexual deviance early Modern Europe inherited from the crusade of Catholic Church against heresy in the Middle Ages (Bray 1982: 19). The elision of sodomy into heresy, the latter word an umbrella term for the transgressions Marlowe's sexuality is associated with, is lexicalised in *bugger*, the legal alternative to the Biblical and literary term *sodomite*. Ultimately derived from *Bulgarus*, Latin for *Bulgarian*, *bugger* is a name originally given to a sect of heretics at large in the Balkans and whose use was later generalised to refer to heretics tout court (OED 1989: 1160 I). As they deviate from official religious doctrine, heretics are held to deviate from other forms of accepted behaviour as well, sexual behaviour included, facilitating the extension and subsequent specialisation of *bugger* to refer to anyone who indulges in sodomy. Marlowe, as a result, is a bugger on both counts: as an atheistic-minded heretic as well as an unrepentant homosexual.

In the long-running feud he maintains with Ingram Frizer, the dog that continually harries him, *foul bugger* is the term of abuse which is invariably hurled at Marlowe. However, the heretical overtones the expression originally has do not become fully apparent until the death scene at the end of the novel. Marlowe's sexual orientation is very much on his murderer's mind as Frizer drives home the dagger into his eye[28]:

> Filthy sodomite. Filthy buggering seducer of men and boys. Nasty Godless sneering fleering bastard [p.267].

[28] See 12.2.3 and 13.1.13 for a fuller discussion of the sexual symbolism of the insertion of the dagger into the eye.

A careful reading of the invective the murderer pours on his victim will reveal the longer second and third phrases to be glosses on the two meanings of *sodomite* contained in the first. Thus, "[f]ilthy buggering seducer" explains the sexual meaning of the term as 'one given to anal intercourse' while the conjoined complements of the post-modifying prepositional phrase, *men* and *boys*, highlights the fact that anal sex between males is meant. The second gloss collapses sodomy into atheism, the adjective *Godless* placing the deviance of opinion in the domain of religious belief, and *sneering* and *fleering* placing emphasis on irreverence and impiety rather than unorthodoxy. Owing to its polysemy, moreover, *Godless* serves as a nexus that links transgressive sexuality to scoffing profanity. On the one hand godlessness is identified with wicked living, including proscribed sexual practices, and on the other, with hostility towards institutional religion. The gloss applies retroactively to *foul bugger* as well. In calling him so, Frizer labels Marlowe not only as a homosexual but also a religious dissident with atheistical leanings.

The denunciation of Marlowe as a "seducer of men and boys" alludes to the egalitarian homosexual liaison he has with Frizer's master on the one hand, and the age-graded one with the Narrator on the other. Although both forms of homosexuality are reviled as disgusting, the first turns out to be even more heinous than the second when the implications it has for the patriarchal power structure are worked out. The combination of masculinity and male-male desire Marlowe embodies explodes the patriarchal assumption that the sexual identity of the self is defined by erotic attraction to the opposite sex, and with it the prescribed gender roles built on this assumption.

Heterosexual intercourse is defined by the penetration of the female by the male, identifying the male as the dominant active partner and the female as the submissive passive one, and consequently gendering dominance and activity masculine, and submission and passivity feminine. Insofar as anal intercourse is also penetrative, the masculine and feminine roles that characterise heterosexual intercourse can be transferred to male-male unions. Traditionally a distinction has been drawn between the sodomite and catamite to identify respectively the active and passive partner in a male homosexual relationship. Such a distinction presupposes stable roles within the relationship, giving rise to gender-marked homosexuality in which one partner assumes the passive feminine role, and the other the active masculine one (Smith 1991: 75). Age-graded relationships, such as the Narrator's liaison with Marlowe, are also gender-

marked in that the younger partner is invariably the catamite who is penetrated, and his older mate the sodomite who penetrates him. Gender-marked male-male unions, whether age-graded or not, pose no threat to the patriarchal power structure because, in reproducing the masculine and feminine roles of heterosexual relationships, they uphold the prescribed gender distinctions which underpin them.

Sodomite and catamite, however, are interchangeable roles. As male homosexuals are endowed with the same organs, there is nothing to stop them from taking turns in penetrating and being penetrated. In the novel several instances of such turn-taking are mentioned, as when Marlowe

> saw an act of buggery proceeding, a double act, turn and turn about with the straw flying and a sneeze timed with a final thrust, *irrumabo* [p.73].

Marlowe himself gives to understand he has performed both roles when questioned on the joys of homosexual love:

> The pleasure is considerable.
> —For the giver or the taker?
> —For both [p.257].

In egalitarian male-male unions, such as Marlowe's affair with Walsingham, the roles must be shared out as neither partner dominates the other. It is precisely the possibility of exchanging roles that makes male homosexuality so alien and disturbing to those who believe in an undivided sexuality. In a heterosexual relation, or so its advocates like to believe, the respective roles of each partner are determined by the reproductive function of their sex. The stability this affords disappears in homosexual unions because of the interchangeability of the active, masculine role and the passive, feminine one. The possibility of playing the man in one encounter, and the woman in another, and with the same partner, cannot but lead to the total collapse of fixed gender roles.

As a non-effeminate homosexual, then, Marlowe's masculinity is an uncomfortable indication of the naturalised rather than natural character of gender distinctions. Unlike sex, which is biologically determined, gender is socially and culturally constructed but is nevertheless perceived to be natural[29] (Butler 1990: 6; Sedgewick 1990: 27-28; Munson Deats 1997: 22). And as gender is a social and cultural construct, it is liable to

[29] Butler (1990: 7) goes on to speculate that sex is as much as a cultural construct as gender, with the result that the sex-gender distinction is an artificial one drawn with a view to providing biological substantiation to gender distinctions.

change and is therefore unstable. Marlowe's sexual militancy, expressed in his profanely tautological reply to Ballard's exhortation to repentance "I am as I am" [p.57], makes him a living reminder of the instability of gender, and as such he is also a source of anxiety insomuch as the breakdown of gender distinctions he embodies inevitably leads to the dissolution of the social order these distinctions uphold. In short, Marlowe's avowal of his homosexuality transforms him into the sodomite, one of the many alien figures thought up by authority that allegedly help to provoke the disintegration of the created order to replace it with a travesty of it (Greenblatt 2005 [1980]: 9). The association of the sodomite with first the collapse and then the parody of order runs parallel with the specialisation undergone by both *sodomy* and *buggery* in the legal discourse of early Modern England. Initially expressing the general notion of debauchery (Bray 1982: 16), and consequently comprising a broad variety of sexual practices considered as aberrant (Bredbeck 1991: 11), *sodomy* gradually comes to signify 'anal intercourse' on account of the legislation criminalising homosexuality passed under the Tudors, although retaining the religious and political associations the term originally carried (Smith 1991: 53). In like manner the sodomite evolves from chaotic to the demonic, from the alien that threatens the dissolution of the ordered universe of Creation (Bray 1982: 25; Dollimore 1991: 238) to one that participates in the counterfeit order created by the Devil, an evolution brought about by the discursive organisation of the alien attending the attempts to account for the pernicious influence he or she exerts (Greenblatt 2005 [1980]: 9). A similar process is discernible in the multiple semantic contagions undergone by *Kit*. Its relation of apophony with *cat* facilitates the transfer of the multiplicity of sexual meanings connoted by the latter term from the noun to the name, which are subsequently pared down to anal intercourse by the eye-alliteration of *Kit* with *know*. In the light of the mythical status the sodomite acquires, then, Marlowe's felinity symbolises not so much the effeminisation concomitant with male-male desire as the absence of an inherent gender and its potential for social and cosmic disorder.

6.4. Recapitulation

The orthographical relation of *know* with *kind* and *Kit* sets in train a concatenation of semantic contagion which brings to the fore Marlowe's sexual orientation, not as an alternative sexuality, as homosexuality is generally viewed today, but as a grave threat to the cosmic and social order heterosexuality represents. As argued in section 6.1, the

Biblical meaning with which the verb is used in *unlawful knowing* brings out the bawdy meanings of the adjective, which are then transferred to the familiar name with the assistance of eye-alliteration. The phonological relation of *Kit*, burdened with the unsavoury connotations carried by *kind* educed by *know*, calls forth the numerous sexual meanings conveyed by *cat*, creating an overall impression of unrestrained lubricity and promiscuity. The identification of Marlowe's sexuality, however, is not made directly by the pairing of orthographically and phonologically related items, but through the revelation of the Narrator's liaison with him and the effeminising effect of the blazon he dedicates to his lover. The net effect of these operations is to invest the feline conceit symbolising Marlowe with associations of aberrant sexuality. The wandering of the philosopher's cat stands for his sexual waywardness, notably his promiscuity and his homosexuality.

Despite the salience given to *know* as a synonym for 'sexual intercourse,' its primary meaning is also of relevance for the delineation of Marlowe's character. The adjective *unlawful* suggests correspondences between homosexuality and unorthodoxy, establishing a cause-effect relation between them. Marlowe is fully at home with his homosexuality but also aware of the universal hostility it excites: hence the carnal version of Platonic love he constructs to justify his sexual inclinations. This heightening of the homoeroticism inherent in Platonism is nevertheless unacceptable, largely because its attempts to hellenise Christ by eroticising his relationship with John the Apostle ranks it as worst instance of blasphemy imaginable. Not only does it contemplate the idea of the Son of God having sex life, in itself worthy of anathema: it also envisages him disobeying his Father by indulging in an outlawed form of sexual intercourse. The use Marlowe puts his scholarship is therefore interpretable as "unlawful knowledge" on two counts: because it relies excessively on teaching that lies outside Christian doctrine, and because it wilfully misapplies prescribed teachings to vindicate precisely actions and opinions they expressly proscribe.

The picture of Marlowe which emerges from his feline characterisation more or less tallies with the image of the turbulent iconoclast projected by the Baines Note. In the novel the author of the note particularises those instances "damnable judgement of religion" he ascribes to Marlowe which expose Christ as a licentious fraud from a bad family —"[t]hat Christ was a bastard and his mother dishonest" (quoted in Steane 1965: 363)— and culminate in the libel concerning the homosexual liaison with John the Apostle quoted in 6.3.2. As they depict Christ as a far from perfect human being rather

than the Son of God, the blasphemies cited are atheistical as well. The slide from blasphemy to atheism is traceable to Marlowe's inability to renounce his homosexuality on the one hand, and the impossibility of reconciling it to Christian dogma.

Despite the correspondences between the Marlowe as the Narrator remembers him and the Marlowe as Baines paints him, there are also discrepancies between the two accounts of the playwright. Looking back at their conversation reproduced in 6.3.3, Marlowe does not affirm that Christ and the beloved disciple were lovers, but in the note the grudging admission of it as a possibility is twisted into an affirmation. Consequently, if the report that Marlowe claimed that "St John the Evangelist was bedfellow to Christ" misrepresents what he actually said to Baines, then it is very likely that the rest of the *dicta* attributed to Marlowe are also untrue, or at least traduced by being quoted out of their original context. These disagreements strongly suggest Marlowe is not quite the firebrand Baines presents him to be, and that the enduring image he bequeaths posterity of the irreverent thug who "cursed and blasphemed to his last gaspe" (quoted in Steane 1965: 3) is a distorted one.

As the commentary of the blazon in 6.2.1 concentrates on Marlowe's physical characteristics, the clause "[o]f Kit's heart I am unsure and can but suppose" [p.4] has been passed over. Despite its brevity, the clause is significant in that it signals the elision of Marlowe's moral qualities from the Narrator's account of him, leaving the reader to infer them from the description of his physical appearance and the enumeration of the most noteworthy of his characteristic actions in the following paragraph. Although the image of the hard-drinking, foul-mouthed smoker may lead the reader to reach the same conclusions as Baines, the Narrator's reticence to venture an opinion on what motivates Marlowe's behaviour sounds a tacit warning against jumping to conclusions about his character. If the Narrator, who claims to have known him intimately, is unable to make Marlowe out, those who knew him less profoundly will be even less competent to judge him. The Narrator may know little, but, like John Marston, Baines and the others who have maligned Marlowe did not really know him at all.

7. The Extension of the Feline Conceit through *Tom*

After *Kit*, *Tom* is the personal name which makes the largest number of token appearances in *A Dead Man in Deptford*. The end-clipped form of *Thomas* owes its high frequency to its multiple designations, that is, the application of the name to various bearers, as evidenced by

13. all these Toms, a world of toms like a night roof top [p.35].

What warrants notice about this excerpt is the pun that exploits the homophonous relation between the name, here used predicatively to mean 'individuals named *Tom*,' and the plural form of the gender marker used to identify a cat as male (OED 1989: 212 XVIII). The effect of the homophony is the same as that of the apophony in [1], "my cat or Kit," namely that of symbolically transforming the various bearers of *Tom* into cats. The process of "cattification" is consequently not restricted to Marlowe but extended, in principle, to the characters bearing the name *Thomas*, although with one important difference. As *tom* sexes cats as male, its onomastic co-homophone genders its bearers masculine, as opposed to *Kit*, which because of its apophony with *cat* —the default term for female cats when it is not used as an epicene noun— genders Marlowe feminine. The semantic opposition set up between *Kit* and *Tom*, therefore, seemingly reinforces the effeminising effect of the blazon of Marlowe's body examined in 6.2.1. The effeminisation of Marlowe is further assisted by the fact that *Kit*, along with its diminutive re-extension *Kitty*, is also the familiar form of *Catherine*. This, as indicated in 6.1.3.2, is made patent by the metanalysis of *Kitticat* into *kitty cat* so that the sobriquet stands in opposition to *tom cat* on the basis of the female/male binarism.

The contrast of a masculine felinity lexicalised via the semantic contagion of *Tom* with a feminine felinity lexicalised in *Kit* re-opens the debate of Marlowe's supposed effeminacy on account of his sexual orientation. More specifically, masculine *Tom* seems to highlight those avatars of the feline conceit which suggest feminine traits. Ranged together, the four Kit-the-cat metaphors plot the domino effect of his nonconformity. Accordingly, Marlowe's sexual and intellectual errancy symbolised by the wandering-cat metaphor impels him to reject the assumptions on which prevailing mores are based, a rejection embodied by the struggling-cat metaphor, in turn exposing him first to the reprobation of powerful, epitomised by the maltreated-cat metaphor, and then their taking of retaliatory action, portended by the drowning-cat metaphor. All the traits represented by each avatar —nonconformity, rebelliousness, vulnerability and

debility— are gendered as feminine because of the contradictory traditional view of women as the weaker sex that none the less has the power to subvert and lead the dominant male astray. The gender-based contrast of *Kit* with *Tom* consequently creates the impression that Marlowe is a helpless victim of the machinations of others.

7.1. Multiple-Designatory *Tom* and the Singularity of *Kit*

In addition to the different connotations of gender each name carries, *Kit* differs from *Tom* in its singularity. Up to six characters answer to *Thomas* in the novel while Marlowe is the only one called *Christopher*, excepting Queen Elizabeth's favourite Sir Christopher Hatton, who appears briefly as the prosecutor in the trial of the Babington plotters [pp.88-90]. Although *Kit* is no more a unique personal name than *Tom* is, it functions as one in the context of the novel because, unlike its masculine counterpart, it identifies its bearer without the need to resort to the family name for disambiguation. The status of *Kit* as a *de facto* unique name suggests the uniqueness of its bearer, and by implication his vulnerability. The pronounced singularity of Marlowe makes him the centre of attention, earning him more the disapproval of his acquaintances for his unconventionality than admiration for his originality. On the interpretation that a singular name correlates with social maladjustment (Savage and Wells 1948: 271; Harman et al. 1968: 109), multiple-designatory *Tom* would be identifiable with the hostility aroused by Marlowe's indiscretion and the tendency of those who feel threatened by his singularity to gang up on him. The singularity of *Kit* and the multiple designation of *Tom* may be regarded as indicative of the tensions existing between Marlowe and his more conventional associates.

7.1.1. Multiple Designation and Referential Ambiguity

Excerpt [13] is first and foremost a complaint about the difficulties entailed in the large number of characters called *Tom* for both the Narrator and reader on account of the referential ambiguity this may give rise to. The confusion the namesakes can cause is a point made on another two occasions:

14. Walsingham, now merely a Tom, another to clog our narrative, was spread on his bed snoring [p.50]
15. Kit was now troubled, as I must myself be, by the fact of three Toms in his London life [p.64].

As in [13], *Tom* is used predicatively in that the name is limited by the indefinite article in [14], and in [15] by a numeral, with the consequent inflection to show plural number.

In all of its three instances the predicative use of *Tom* throw into relief the disruptive effect of multiple designation on the principal function of core personal names, the primary identification of their bearers.

The problematic nature of multiple-designatory *Tom* is impressed upon the reader in the misunderstanding enacted in the passage reviewed in 3.1.2 to illustrate the concept of non-equivalent repetition:

> Watson dug a shilling from his purse. Kit yelled for Tom. Watson started. But Tom was no uncommon name. The Tom that entered was a boy, tousled and with an incisor missing, bare feet filthy and jerkin too large [p.9].

The Narrator's observation that "Tom was no uncommon name" anticipates both the multi-designatory character of *Tom* and the resolution to the mix-up occasioned by the reported summons of Watson's namesake. The entry of the serving boy dispels the referential ambiguity of *Tom* at the same time it reveals and highlights its dual designation, responsible for the ambiguity in the first place. With his arrival it is borne in on the reader that the first token appearance of *Tom* is not co-referential with *Watson*, even though the familiar name is known to be applicable to the bearer of the family name on the strength of his prior self-introduction *Thomas Watsonus I.V. studiosus*, and subsequent recognition as Thomas Watson the author of the *Antigone* [p.9].

In itself the comic turn involving the dual designation of *Tom* is not of great consequence: Young Tom is a minor character who makes no further appearances in the novel. However, the description "no uncommon name" presages the appearance of other characters of the same name. The next namesake to appear is fellow playwright Thomas Kyd, whose first reference is under the demotic full name *Tom Kyd* [p.15]. The referential ambiguity attending multiple designations comes to the fore again in the passage relating Marlowe's introduction to the playhouse fraternity [pp.14-26], in which Watson and Kyd appear together. This passage contains an even more graphic illustration of multiple designation and the problems it poses than the one provided in the passage quoted above:

> —We will save up money to send you to Cambridge, Tom, Watson said. Or to the other shop if you would wish it.
> —My Latin is as good as any's, Kyd cried [p.18].

The point to make about the second extract is the role played by punctuation in the disambiguation of *Tom*. Both *Watson* and *Kyd* are the subjects of reporting clauses, identifying their bearers as the respective sources of the direct speech preceding each

clause. Since the name occurs in Watson's contribution to the exchange with Kyd, *Tom* is co-referential with *you*, and both are co-referential with *Kyd*, which names Watson's interlocutor. Instrumental to the disambiguation of the familiar name are the commas which isolate it. The first comma separates *Tom* from the rest of reported clause to indicate that it is being used for vocative address, while the second separates the entire reported clause from the one which governs it. Yet if the second comma is taken away, *Tom* will be co-referential with *Watson*, as an element of a demotic full name. The importance of the second comma for the correct identification of the bearer of the pet name serves as a subtle reminder of the problems that multiple designation holds for the Narrator, particularly in the case of characters of relevance to the narrative.

7.1.2. The Feral Associations of Multi-Designatory Tom

Excerpts [13]-[15] all turn on the stumbling blocks the existence of so many namesakes place in the Narrator's attempts to observe the maxim of manner, which enjoins him to avoid ambiguity and obscurity of expression (Grice 1975: 46). The phrasing of [15], however, gives to understand that the "three Toms" mentioned pose a more serious problem for Marlowe. On expanding the citation,

> Kit was now troubled, as I must myself be, by the fact of three Toms in his London life, for Kyd was like to be a kind of rivalrous friend, and one Tom of them most especial, nay golden and crowned,

it will be seen that Marlowe's problem is of a more personal nature, related to the emotional demands each of his three acquaintances make on him. On reading the fragment in the light of excerpt [13], moreover, this problem is compounded by the designs they may have on him. The transition from predicative *Toms* to the masculine gender marker *toms* and the absence of a quantifier both conspire to suggest that Marlowe's three London friends are not the only ones that want something from him. This implies a further extension of the feline conceit in that the legion of anonymous toms referred to stand for all those whose interest Marlowe claims, whether they go by the name of *Tom* or not.

The reference to the "night roof top" introduces a sinister note as regards the intentions of these toms. If the wandering-cat metaphor represents Marlowe's itinerancy, intellectual and sexual as well as geographical, the nocturnal setting of the Narrator's image evokes the dubious moral atmosphere of the locales his peregrinations take him through. In this dark murky world the term *toms* connotes a menacing form of

masculine felinity by conjuring up the image of a predator stalking its prey. A new feline metaphor emerges as a result, namely that of the cat on the prowl, though with the difference that this interpretative frame is not applied to Marlowe, but to his acquaintances. He is now the wandering cat tailed by predatory tom cats awaiting the first opportunity to take her by surprise.

The subtext of barely contained sexual tension is reminiscent of the image of unbridled lust summoned up in "the cat will after kind," discussed in 6.1.3.1. In this context, however, there is a reversal of roles. The introduction to 6.2 began with the suggestion that the cat referred to is a female on heat looking for a mate, whereas here the nocturnal roof-top image presents a plurality of aroused tom cats following a solitary female. Marlowe emerges, as a result, as an object of desire they all endeavour to possess.

The nocturnal feline universe the Narrator refers to may well be read as a paraphrase of "all cats are grey in the dark." As regards Marlowe, the concept that the night obscures all distinguishing features may be related to the sensation of anonymity created by the undifferentiated plural reference to "all these Toms" that discreetly keep tabs on him. The reasons why they should follow his every move may vary but, because these motives are unknown to him, they are in effect indistinguishable from one another. In the case of the "three Toms," who are all identifiable, the proverb elicited has to do more with their inscrutability. They all share an interest in Marlowe they all take care to dissimulate, their common duplicity blurring whatever differences that may exist between their respective relationships with him. The multiple designation of *Tom* is therefore linked to the notion of obscurity, not knowing who is who, or what their true, and often hostile, intentions really are.

7.1.3. The Singularity of Kit *and the Peculiarity of Marlowe*

The sexually charged subtext to "all these toms like a night roof top" relates the singularity of *Kit* to the sexual orientation of its bearer, and more concretely, to his awareness of the centrality of his sexual orientation to the conception he has of himself. As seen in the examination of the confession episode in 6.3.1 and 6.3.2, Marlowe's sexual self-awareness makes him gay *avant la lettre*. In an age in which male homosexuality is reduced to the commission of proscribed genital acts any man is prone to do on account of his innately sinful nature, Marlowe is unique in defining his identity in terms of his choice of erotic object of desire. He attributes his troubled relation with

the world to his exclusion from a social and cosmic order based on divinely ordained gender distinctions. “Male and female created he them,” Father Ballard reminds him by quoting Genesis 1: 27 to refute Marlowe’s claim that he “was born so” [p.57]. To be more precise, and anachronistic, Burgess’s Marlowe is describable as non-scene, because a gay scene simply does not exist.

The confession episode is interpretable as an instantiation of the gesture of coming out, an speech act performed through explicit self-declaration (Butler 1997: 22). Although closeted in the confines of the confessional, Marlowe may be regarded as having come out in that he makes a voluntary announcement of his sexual orientation. However, as Sedgwick (1990: 67-9) points out, one of the concomitants of being gay in a homophobic society is that one is never definitively out, but condemned to repeat the gesture of disclosing one’s homosexuality. So it is with Marlowe. When Watson, after commending the phrase *breasts prest* in Marlowe’s Englishing of Ovid, enquires whether he is “a lover of breasts” [p.10], Marlowe promptly answers that he is “given otherwise” (see 6.2.5). Although more circumspect, Marlowe does not conceal his homosexuality when he makes his acquaintance with Walsingham, broadly hinting at his sexual preferences by discoursing on the spirituality of male-male unions (see 6.2.4.2). In each of the three instances of coming out Marlowe is handicapped by the absence of an adequate terminology with which to describe his sexual identity more adequately. *Sodomy*, the term Ballard uses, refers disapprovingly to anal sex, but reveals nothing about the sexuality of those who engage in it, which Marlowe can make reference to only by vague statements like “I was born so” and, blasphemously echoing Jehovah in the guise of the burning bush, “I am as I am.” Similarly, “I am given otherwise” and the recourse to the idiom of Platonic love are indicative of the difficulty of creating a homophilic discourse as a result of the lack of a language with which to develop it. Male-male desire is not so much a love that dare not as one that cannot speak its name.

The unfortunate consequence of Marlowe’s forthrightness is to cause him to be pigeon-holed as a sodomite. The Narrator’s generalisation “that the sodomitical seek to avoid ocular discourse as speaking too much of the (...) union of hearts” [p.4] presupposes that the sodomite is a recognisable type, only that, in the light of the general acceptation of *sodomy* as a vice, what defines him is his immorality rather than his preference for males as sexual partners. As those with whom he has dealings with

are unable to conceptualise homosexuality, they cannot but conclude that Marlowe is a shameless profligate with a taste for forbidden sexual acts given to boasting about his perversion. In the light of their ignorance, the night roof top to which the various milieux Marlowe moves around in is compared is symbolic of the benighted bigotry of its denizens. The toms that haunt him see him first as a dissolute eccentric to be ridiculed, and then, in the wake of the allegations of his supposed atheism, a threat to the stability of the established order that must be neutralised.

7.2. *Eros* and *Philia* in Marlowe's Relationships

The amplification of [15] narrows multi-designatory *Tom* down to the three most relevant bearers of name in *A Dead Man in Deptford*. One of them is referred to by his family name, greatly facilitating his identification: the "rivalrous friend" is the playwright Thomas Kyd, known primarily for his one-off box-office success *The Spanish Tragedy*, and with whom Marlowe has an uneasy professional association. The exalted tone of the reformulation of *most especial* which closes the fragment, *nay crowned and golden*, identifies the referent of *one Tom of them* as Thomas Walsingham, the man Marlowe is in love with. The third namesake is named in the opening sentence to the paragraph the excerpt is taken from: "In Tom Watson's house, at the corner of Bishopsgate and Hog Lane, Kit found the poet at work." The reference to Thomas Watson as *the poet* alludes to the "common concern with poetic trafficking" [p.32] which draws him and Marlowe together. The wording of the references to Kyd and Walsingham identifies them by placing them at either extreme of a scale based on the strength of their claim on Marlowe's affections. The stilted hyperbole with which the reference to Walsingham is crouched leaves no doubt as to the paramountcy accorded to Marlowe's romantic attachment to him, although its high-flown style insinuates insincerity and therefore casts doubt on the worth of the relationship. Although Kyd is referred to as a friend of Marlowe's, the hedge *kind of* and the adjective *rivalous* divests *friend* of the amity the term normally conveys to suggest that they are colleagues who compete against, rather than co-operate with, one another. By implication Watson falls between Walsingham and Kyd: he is neither an object of desire nor a competitor, but an acquaintance with whom Marlowe appears to enjoy a friendly rapport. The passage not only identifies the three namesakes but also rank-orders them according to the closeness of the emotional bond which ties Marlowe to each one.

What merits attention about this hierarchy of relationships is the pride of place it gives to sexual desire or *eros*. The description of Kyd as "a kind of rivalrous friend," however, implies that each of Marlowe's relationships are definable as friendship despite the different tenor of each one. The torrid affair he has with Walsingham differs sharply from the working partnerships he has with both Kyd and Watson, and the amicable temper of his association with Watson contrasts markedly with the jealousy which bedevils his relations with Kyd. Turning to Aristotle's discussion on friendship in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, one becomes aware of the symmetry between Kyd, Watson and Walsingham and the three types of friend the philosopher identifies, namely the useful friend, the solicitous friend and the pleasing friend (2000: 145-6)[30]. Of the three types of friendship enumerated, Aristotle goes on to contend, only the second may be regarded as true friendship, or *philia*, because it is the only one that is grounded on a genuine concern for the well-being and interests of the friend (2000: 147). Instrumental and hedonistic friendships, by contrast, only last as long as they are useful and pleasurable. Owing to the premium placed on *eros*, Marlowe's view on male-male relationships challenges the Aristotelian identification of friendship with *philia*, virtuous love. In privileging his homosexual affair with Walsingham, Marlowe subscribes to the Platonic recognition of erotic desire as integral to male bonding and controverts the Aristotelian ideal of a male-male relation free of sexual attraction. Unfortunately for Marlowe, it is the Aristotelian notion of friendship that prevails as a model of male bonding among his contemporaries, at least officially, a prevalence that inevitably leads to the degrading of male-male *eros* to sodomy.

7.2.1. Orderly and Disorderly Unions: Philia, Eros *and Sodomy*

The precedence given to *philia* over the other two types of friendship in Aristotle's tripartite classification points to an absence of unanimity in classical Antiquity over the valuation of *eros* and its role in male-male relationships. The Platonic view Marlowe subscribes to sees sexual desire as integral to friendship (Smith 1991: 37), fundamentally as a means of bringing the friends together so that they may initiate the soul's return to the empyrean. In Socrates' second speech in the *Phaedrus* the sudden beguiling of the lover-friend on seeing his beloved for the first time, condensed in the amatory commonplace "love at first sight," is explained as a celestial vision in which his soul remembers the absolute beauty of the ideal world it comes from. The ecstatic

[30] Roger Crisp's translation.

recollection of its prior existence, triggered by the beauty of the beloved, is what causes the lover's soul to take wing and begin the ascent to the world of Forms it has fallen from. Where Marlowe differs from Plato is the importance the former accords to genital sex, which he, as argued in 6.2.4.2, identifies with the force which propels the soul on its return journey. In his speech Socrates draws a distinction between love and lust, and warns against the danger of confusing the one for the other in

> [n]ow the man who is not fresh from his initiation or has been corrupted does not quickly make the transition from beauty on earth to absolute beauty; so when he sees its namesake here he feels no reverence for it, but surrenders himself to sensuality and is eager like a four-footed beast to mate and beget children, or in his addiction to wantonness feels no fear or shame in pursuing a pleasure which is unnatural (1973: 57)[31].

The strictures on the pursuit of unnatural pleasure would suggest that the lover should not satisfy the desire the beloved arouses in him, underscoring its role as a means of male bonding.

Aristotle takes a much less positive view on *eros*. In his summary of Aristotelian notion of friendship Smith (1991: 35-6) stresses its rational and egalitarian conception. True friendship is possible between only virtuous men, governed by reason rather than dominated by passion, enabling them to respect one another's integrity. A relationship in which there is sexual attraction, by contrast, can never be disinterested or egalitarian because each partner is driven by the urge to satisfy their desire, and therefore dependent on the other for the satisfaction of that desire. The inequality of such a relationship is more pronounced in associations in which desire is experienced by only one of the partners. Unrequited love either drives the spurned lover into a state of desperation, a popular theme in classical literature, or gives emotional leverage to his unscrupulous beloved to make him do whatever it wants him to do. Whereas *philia* ensures stability because it makes friends equals, *eros* threatens instability because it induces the partners to overwhelm and possess one another. The constancy of friendship and the volatility of romance is the criterion for Chedgzoy's distinction between orderly and disorderly unions (2004: 245), in this case between relationships that conform to culturally prescribed models of male-male unions, and those which subvert and disrupt them.

[31] Walter Hamilton's translation.

The qualifications *orderly* and *disorderly* are indicative of the social repercussions of interpersonal relationships. As stated in the introduction to 6.3, the public culture inferred from *A Dead Man in Deptford* is a male-dominated one with a markedly homophobic moral discourse. As a result of this moral climate of homophobia, the Aristotelian dichotomy between *philia* and *eros* is represented in the twin image of the male friend and the sodomite (Bray 1990: 1): "the one (...) universally admired, the other execrated and feared." Although conceived as polar opposites, the friend and the sodomite nevertheless "paralleled each other in an uncanny way" (Bray 1990: 1). It is precisely because of the close parallel between them that makes the sodomite such an execrated and feared figure. What facilitates the drawing of the parallel is the publicly displayed intimacy between friends such as kissing and embracing to externalise the emotional bond between them (Bray 1990: 5). What is originally a legitimate expression of affection between males is usurped so that the unnatural intimacy of the sodomite may be passed off as the effusive demonstrations of amity expected between friends. The disorderly sodomitical relationship is therefore all the more execrable and fearful on account of its insidious facility to counterfeit an orderly male friendship by appropriating the outward tokens of friendship. Worse still, the physical intimacy of friendship may act as an incitement to sodomy, a lapse which may befall any man to due to the corrupt nature of humankind as a result of the Fall. Underlying the anxiety of the usurpation of friendship by sodomy, or the transformation of the one into the other, is the sneaking suspicion erotic attraction is an aspect of male friendship. The contingency of sodomy coupled with the unconscious acknowledgement that it is a debased state one may slide down to is the mainspring of the homophobia exhibited by the predominant discourse of Marlowe's culture. It is a form of overcompensation for the fear of failing to keep one's appetites under control and being overwhelmed by them.

At first sight the opposition between friendship and sodomy corresponds to the distinction Sedgewick (1985: 1) draws between male homosociality and male homosexuality. The term *homosocial*, formed by analogy with *homosexual*, is used to describe social bonds between persons of the same sex with a view to promoting the interests common to their sex, and in a patriarchal society male homosociality is directed at solidifying the all-male power structure which upholds it. However, even though homosociality is often characterised by intense homophobia, men loving men is not necessarily inimical to men promoting the interests of men (Sedgewick 1985: 4).

Consequently, a distinction may be drawn between patriarchal societies in which homosexuality is elided into homosociality and those which separate these two forms of social bonding among males. Classical Greece, in particular fifth-century Athens, constitutes the paradigm case of homosexual homosociality, demonstrating in passing that patriarchy requires heterosexuality for its maintenance, but not homophobia (Sedgewick 1985: 4). The society of early Modern England is more problematical in this respect, largely because of the blending of the homophilic classical and homophobic Biblical traditions which characterises Renaissance civilisation. While moral discourse demonises, and legal discourse criminalises, homosexuality in the reduced form of sodomy, the power structure of sixteenth-century England conspires with the social arrangements based on the effective segregation of the sexes to encourage, albeit inadvertently, the erotic potential of the male bonds they foster (Smith 1991: 56), abetted by a literary discourse strongly influenced by classical models. The resulting ambiguity helps to account for the inconsistency detected between the virulence and frequency of the strictures pronounced on sodomy and, in spite of the abundant legislation against sodomy, the dearth of prosecutions for homosexuality (Bray 1982: 71). Although stressing the meeting of minds rather than sexuality, the Platonism which informs early Modern conventions of male friendship serves to sublimate the erotic attraction the intimates may have for each other and present it in a socially acceptable form. When an accusation of sodomy is brought against somebody, it is usually in combination with other imagined crimes, usually heresy, treason and witchcraft (Bray 1982: 20), crimes imputed to Marlowe and branded on the name he is most called by.

The theoretical polarisation of male relationships into prescribed and proscribed unions is embodied in Marlowe's relationships with Watson and Walsingham. To some extent the polarity of the friend and sodomite is inscribed in the name borne by Marlowe's two acquaintances. Their common forename, *Thomas*, is derived, via the Greek *Didymos*, from the Aramaic for 'twin' (Pickering 2004 [1999]: 344). Twin-ship, moreover, may also symbolise the difficulty of telling sodomy and friendship apart because of their tendency to shade into one another, hinted at by the quasi-alliterative relation between *Watson* and *Walsingham*. The phonological bond between the family names also serves as a reminder of the susceptibility of orderly unions to sliding down to disorderly ones, particularly if one of the partners is already perverted. The ambiguity is embodied by Marlowe himself in that in relation to Watson he acts the friend, and in

relation to Walsingham the sodomite. By virtue of his double role as friend and sodomite, then, Marlowe personifies the indeterminacy, and therefore precariousness, of male-male relationships on account of the potentiality of *eros* to rear its disruptive head in initially non-sexual male relationships, be they virtuous friendships, like Marlowe's relationship with Watson, or instrumental friendships, like his association with Kyd.

7.2.2. Male Friendship

Outwardly, Marlowe's relationships with both Walsingham and Watson conform to early Modern reformulation of the Aristotelian paradigm of male friendship: hence the validity of the twin-ship inscribed in *Thomas*. His friendships with the namesakes differ from its model in one important respect. Whereas Aristotle emphasises equality, the Elizabethans presuppose inequality, its most familiar expression being the relationship of the patron with his client. In late Tudor England a friend is not so much a person for whom one professes a liking and who reciprocates that liking as a highly placed person who uses his influence in the interests of his intimate (Bray 198: 3-8). So envisaged, friendship is a form of sponsored mobility (Stone 1966: 47) whereby a talented young man is selected by a person of higher social rank for advancement in return for his loyalty. Friendship is therefore symmetrical in the sense that it is based on reciprocity but asymmetrical in terms of power. The protégé enjoys his patron's favour as long as he repays the favours he receives by furthering the latter's interest from the position he has been granted through the mediation of his benefactor: the beneficiary's failure to honour the agreement will result in the withdrawal of favour and the end of his career. In neither of Marlowe's relationships is the patron-client model of friendship just described a permanent feature of the association. In the case of his relationship with Watson this pattern applies only in the early stage of their acquaintance, quickly evolving to the homosocial egalitarian friendship of the Aristotelian mould. In the case of the second relationship the process is reversed: Marlowe and Walsingham are apparently equals until the latter's inheritance of the family estate, an event leading to the imposition of the patron-client model.

Watson is the first to befriend Marlowe, and is sufficiently well connected to be able to launch the obscure undergraduate in divinity into the twin careers of playwright and spy. Impressed by Marlowe's gift for poetry, demonstrated by the translation of Ovid he chances to see and read, Watson suggests that he should consider writing plays and invites him to London so that he can be introduced to the playhouse fraternity. Watson

is already a poet and playwright of some standing and is prepared to ask his colleagues to see a sample of Marlowe's work with a view to future employment. In response to Marlowe's earlier complaint that "no man can live on" poetry [p.11], Watson gives out to be an intimate friend of Francis Walsingham and offers to arrange an interview with the spymaster with the aim of more immediate employment. Although no formal agreement is made, it is understood that Marlowe shall collaborate with his mentor in the composition of stage plays in exchange for the trouble Watson has taken to start him on his career. Once Marlowe has gained a reputation as the author of top-grossing plays, their relationship is re-established on a footing of equality, although he never forgets the debt of gratitude he owes to Watson for his initial generosity. Watson's mentorship, however, is not without its adverse effects for his discovery. Although Marlowe has Watson's good offices to thank for his success, they nevertheless lead to his death, engineered by two of his colleagues in the Service. This makes him an accessory to Marlowe's murder, albeit an indirect and unwitting one, in turn making *Tom* an instantiation of the prowling-cat metaphor which frames Watson as one that brings about, if not consciously works for, Marlowe's downfall in spite of the friendship they cultivate.

One of the consequences of Watson's intervention on Marlowe's behalf is the latter's acquaintance with Thomas Walsingham, struck up immediately after Marlowe's induction into the Service. On introducing himself, Walsingham includes the wistful confession that he is merely a "younger son who does not inherit" [p.31]. Technically, this makes their incipient relationship one between social equals, despite Marlowe's plebeian background as "a cobbler's son" [p.7]. Although born into the gentry, his status as a second son debars Walsingham from gentlemanly status (Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg 1995: 551), a relegation matched by the unspecified menial post he says he holds in the intelligence service run by his cousin, who "uses me at times, not often" [p.31]. After graduating Marlowe becomes Walsingham's social superior because his Master's degree elevates him to the rank of gentleman (Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg 1995: 551). This situation is reversed when Walsingham inherits the family estate on his elder brother's death, whereby he not only regains the social rank he is deprived of, but also accorded public pre-eminence due to the magistracy that goes with his new station. Socially, then, Walsingham is initially Marlowe's social equal, then temporarily his social inferior and finally his social superior.

On coming into his inheritance, Walsingham acquires the social standing which Watson lacks, and as a result is in a better position to help his protégé on in his career. His invitation to take up residence with him at Scadbury, the family seat, is a mark of special favour bestowed on Marlowe, or countenance (Bray 1990: 5): not only does it advertise the country gentleman's interest in the dramatist, it also affords him the leisure to devote himself entirely to poetry, the calling which Marlowe has hitherto been unable to pursue. More importantly, Walsingham can offer him protection, as he does when he warns Marlowe of the unspecified dangers resulting from his friend's association with Raleigh:

> —Yes, you are one of Raleigh's tribe. Raleigh must be on guard.
> —This he knows.
> —You will be safe with me.
> —Am I in danger?
> —If Raleigh cannot be easily struck, others may be in manner of a warning [p.182].

More than Watson Walsingham discharges all the duties incumbent on the responsible patron: he offers Marlowe a post which gives him scope to develop his literary talents and ensures that he comes to no harm through his contacts among the powerful.

The two relationships also illustrate the theme of the inevitability of marriage Smith (1991: 72) discerns in Shakespeare's comedies and tragicomedies. The resolution of these plays invariably involves male friendship yielding heterosexual love whereby the friend who remains a bachelor is forsaken for the bride. The supersession of friendship by marriage throws into relief the "obligatory heterosexuality" (Sedgewick 1985: 3) built into patriarchy, whether tolerant of or hostile to homosexuality. Both relationships are indispensable for the maintenance of patriarchy, but each belongs to a different period of a man's life. In his early manhood his allegiance lies with his friend, but on changing his marital status his allegiance is transferred to his spouse. Marlowe's relationship with Walsingham more or less fits to this pattern, as evidenced by the mercenary announcement that "I shall marry soon. I think you have guessed that, I need the dowry. You would have to go" [p.249]. In announcing his prospective marriage, Walsingham in effect declares their friendship as over and gives notice that Marlowe is to go his own way, a separation foreshadowed by Watson's marriage. The immediate consequence of the latter union is that Marlowe can no longer stay with Watson whenever he is in London:

> —You lodge with Tom Watson? Poley asked, out in the wind of Temple Bar.

> —No longer. He said he would not marry but he has married. The sister of this lawyer Swift. I ride tonight to stay with Tom Walsingham. But I shall be early in tomorrow, as you request.
> —From Tom to Tom [pp.83-4].

Although perceived as a betrayal, Watson's marriage does not put an end to his association with Marlowe, as its only outcome is that Marlowe has to rent his own lodgings when he comes down from Cambridge. While confirming the inevitability of marriage, Watson's change of marital status nevertheless gives the lie to the presupposition of incompatibility of marriage with friendship underlying the resolution of Shakespeare's comedies.

The different effects of obligatory heterosexuality on Marlowe's two relationships highlight the fuzziness of the distinction between friendship and sodomy. Paradoxically, the survival of his friendship with Watson after the latter has married exemplifies the fracture between homosociality and homosexuality which characterises homophobic patriarchy. Although Marlowe is a practising homosexual, and Watson a married heterosexual, they manage to maintain an amicable working partnership devoid of sexual desire, in keeping with the Aristotelian notion of *philia*. Equally paradoxical is the blending of homosociality with homosexuality illustrated by Walsingham's prospective change of marital status which definitively ends his affair with Marlowe, more in line with the homophilic patriarchy in the Hellenist mould. In contrast to the harmonious co-existence of heterosexuality with homosexuality defining Marlowe and Watson's friendship, moreover, the displacement of homosexuality by heterosexuality which terminates Marlowe's romance with Walsingham upholds the view that homophobia is as necessary a consequence of patriarchy as heterodoxy is. The announcement of Walsingham's marriage is tantamount to a withdrawal of favour, which is all the more distressing because favour is withdrawn precisely when Marlowe is in most need of protection: when he is under investigation for holding and airing heretical views and consequently in fear of his life. From the point of view of the prevailing moral discourse, however, Walsingham's failure to fulfil his obligations towards Marlowe is not to be censured as an act of ingratitude to a faithful retainer, but rather applauded as the infliction of condign punishment on a sodomite that has passed himself off as a faithful retainer.

7.2.3. Sodomy

At a deeper level the non-equivalent repetition of *Tom* in Robert Poley's quip, "[f]rom Tom to Tom," is indicative of the parallel processes whereby Walsingham's influence on Marlowe is on the ascendant while Watson's is on the wane. Ablative *from* and adlative *to* signal figurative as well as literal distancing from and approximation to the bearers of the first and second token appearance of the name, identified in the context of the exchange as Watson and Walsingham respectively. As the former is Marlowe's friend and the latter his beloved, the move from the one to the other represents the slippage from friendship to sodomy disguised as friendship, a scenario in which Marlowe is branded the sodomite and Walsingham his trusting victim.

As seen in 7.2.1, the early Modern concept of sodomy plays on fears of the potential of *eros* for social disruption. What makes the sodomite so insidious is his ability to corrupt. No sooner has he gained his victim's trust and affection than the sodomite begins to initiate him in all the vices he is versed in until his unsuspecting partner is as depraved as his seducer. The seduction and subsequent corruption of the impressionable young man is all the more reprehensible when the individual that seduces and corrupts him is his social inferior. It is precisely this combination of sexual transgression with lack of social pedigree that contributes to the perception of the sodomite as a threat to the established order. Making themselves desirable to their betters offers a means of social advancement to the base-born with no other merit to recommend them than their ability to charm. What is worse, the target of the sodomite's wiles may end up so besotted with his suitor that he will forget his station and the obligations incumbent on them, with potentially catastrophic consequences for the social fabric. The emotional thrall in which the sodomite holds his doting admirer not only places pleasure before duty but also overturn what is considered the natural relation of subordination between a gentleman and a commoner. If men of high rank allow themselves to be ruled by their socially inferior but emotionally dominant minions through their baser passions, then the power relations that sustain the social order may well be thrown completely out of gear, the first step towards dissolution and chaos. More than a sexual social climber, then, the sodomite is anarchist insomuch as his influence leads to the destruction of the established order.

Marlowe's love affair with Walsingham is particularly susceptible to being interpreted as an instance of an upstart appropriating and subverting the accepted conventions of friendship to debauch a callow and trusting young man of gentle birth.

This is exactly the construction placed on the relationship by Ingram Frizer. Shortly after the affair been consummated, Walsingham's manservant and self-appointed guardian confronts his master's lover over what he understands to be the latter's bad influence:

> My office is to protect him I serve and I will not have you nor any other do him harm by slyly getting under my guard [p.55].

The blame for the affair is placed squarely on Marlowe: if Walsingham consents to it, it is because he has been led astray by the bad example set by his seducer. To some extent Marlowe's sexed-up Neo-Platonism discussed in 6.2.4.2 gives Frizer reason to be suspicious. The intimation that they are reunited soul mates can be construed as a ploy to persuade Walsingham to yield to his advances by impressing on him the inevitability and legitimacy of their having sex. The occurrence of *capriciously* in Walsingham's summary of the creation myth recounted in the *Symposium* subtly shows up Marlowe's philosophising to be an indirect and hesitant proposition to this end. The adverb literally means 'in the manner of a goat,' that is: in the manner of an animal which has become a byword for male lubricity. Marlowe's pedantry is, on this interpretation, is more than a line adopted to chat up a potential sexual partner: it is an attempt to draw an unwary young man into the iniquitous orbit of the sodomite.

Marlowe's confrontation with Frizer sets the tone and pattern for their subsequent encounters. Frizer's slighting reference to Marlowe's homosexuality and comminatory hint at the consequences that will fall out if he does not desist from his attempts to debauch Walsingham in

> [y]ou are no more than a drunken booby and foul bugger. And I do not speak of myself, for I can put men on to you that strike to the very liver [p.55]

is a constant of the acrimonious exchanges that characterise their meetings. The "foul bugger's" appointment as poet resident prompts Frizer, now Walsingham's steward, to issue the warning that "[t]here is to be no more beastliness" [p.191], a reminder of Marlowe's "unnatural filthiness" and Frizer's intention to act to prevent him from strengthening his hold over his master. Marlowe's "beastliness" is uppermost in Frizer's mind when he finally kills Walsingham's minion in that, as seen in 6.3.5, the string of insults he utters on dealing the mortal blow have a direct bearing on his victim's perceived misdoings.

7.2.4. Repressed Eros *in Thomas Kyd*

At first sight, sexual desire is entirely absent from Marlowe's dealings with Thomas Kyd, as they are from his friendship with Thomas Watson. Their relationship operates on a purely consultative basis consisting of the occasional, and grudging, asking and giving of favours, notably Marlowe's picking Kyd's brains on the tricks of the playwright's trade [pp.15-8] and the request to make a copy of the anti-Arian tract for Walter Raleigh in his "admirable Italian hand" [p.194]. The association is vitiated by Kyd's jealousy, definable first as the fear of being upstaged by a talented newcomer to the business, and then as the envy at the former neophyte's success. In the final analysis their relationship is characterised by mutual antipathy rather than amity: Marlowe and Kyd do not even like each other, let alone feel attracted by one another.

From the references to sex made in relation to Kyd, moreover, one concludes that he lacks a sex life. The Narrator's description of him as "timid with boy and woman alike" [p.142] implies celibacy, and the phrasing of

> Kit would sometimes come when Kyd was out to woo me into undressing with I love thee I love thee

strongly suggests disapproval of fornication, especially between males. The impression that Kyd's sexual abstinence is bred of his prudishness is borne out by his assertion that "[y]ou cannot bugger on stage" [p.19] in the way of an endorsement of Ned Alleyn's damning verdict of "sodomitical" on "[t]his business of Jupiter and Ganymede," in reference to the opening scene of *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, Marlowe's reworking of Book VI of Virgil's *Aeneid*. At the tavern conference after the performance of his *Spanish Tragedy* Kyd gives indications that his disapproval of homoeroticism is not limited to its theatrical representation. Observing Marlowe making advances to the Narrator, he puts an end to the amorous play with a peremptory

> this is not Plato's Symposium. Learn discretion. Take your hand away [p.25].

The reference to the *Symposium* in telling Marlowe to desist in his drunken lovemaking, reminiscent of Jupiter's dalliance with Ganymede in his dramatisation of the myth, triggers the homoerotic associations evoked by the Platonic dialogue only to heap scorn on paederasty. The supper party Watson throws after the conference bears sufficient resemblance to banquet Agathon hosts to give point to Kyd's rebuke: both occasions are all-male get-togethers attended by members of the same social class in which they dine and wine, engage in general conversation and generally relax. The injunction to stop

petting the Narrator, prefaced by the remark that Marlowe tries "to be too much the Greek," alludes to the main topic of conversation of Agathon's symposium, with its emphasis on male-male love. However, Kyd's denial that they are attending is Plato's *Symposium* stresses its dissimilarity with the social occasion depicted in the dialogue, especially as regards its homophilia. Although it does come up for discussion during their night out together, homoeroticism is only one of the talking points raise, derogated to the "sodomitical" through Kyd's disapproval of Marlowe's weakness for boys punctuated by the familiar warning to "[l]earn discretion."

However, a non-existent sex life does not mean the absence of sexuality, even though it is stifled by prudery. Especially telling is the sequel to Kyd's endorsement of the strictures on enacting homoerotic love-making onstage:

> Though in his eyes it seemed he cherished the notion though not as an act of twofold pleasure: he relished the fancied scream as the punitive rod of flesh struck home [p.19].

The momentary thrill he experiences from envisaging the moment of penetration reveals sadistic rather than homosexual tendencies, indicated by the emphasis given to the pain rather than the pleasure caused by anal sex. The elision of sexual ecstasy into pain evoked by *the fancied scream* is effectuated through *the punitive rod of flesh*, in which the coarse meaning of 'erect penis' conveyed by the head of the phrase is overlaid by the disciplinary meaning of 'instrument to chastise offenders with' on account of the pre-modifying adjective. Kyd's fleeting erotic day-dream carries resonances of the cruel and humiliating death reputedly suffered by Edward II, the homosexual hero of Marlowe's eponymous play. At the Deptford meeting one of Marlowe's companions refers approvingly to the insertion of a red-hot spit into the King's anus as a punishment made to fit the crime:

> It must be most painful to have a hard rod thrust into the nether orifice. That was a most painful punishment you had for the King in your play. Painful but fitting [p.257].

The echoic rendering of "rod of flesh" into "hard rod" subtly transforms erect penis Kyd envisages in his reverie into the iron spit Nicholas Skeres imagines, although the semantic congruence of *punitive* and *punishment* on the one hand, and *pain* and *painful* on the other, sustains the common idea of castigating the sodomite for his sexual transgression.

The family name *Kyd* is a pointer to his suppressed sexuality, underwritten by its relation of quasi-homophony with *Kit*. Among other associations, the foregrounding of the names through syntactic patterning discernible in

> Kit and Watson, Alleyn, Kyd and I trod the slimy cobbles thither [p.16]

and

> Kyd gorged. Tom Watson ate with delicacy. Kit drank deep and praised the Beregerac red [p.24]

educes the homophonous relation of *Kyd* with *kid*, which in turn calls forth *goat*, the term denoting an animal proverbial for its propensity to copulation (Williams 1994: 606 I) and linking sexual promiscuity to the devil (Young Greg 1997: 186): hence *goatish*, meaning 'lecherous' (Partridge 1968 [1947]: 116). The sexual meanings thus attached to the name foster the suspicion that the Puritanism he displays stems more from the frustration of his unacknowledged sexual inclinations than a genuine sense of propriety. What is more, the clause "Kyd gorged" insinuates a gargantuan, if unsatisfied, sexual appetite to match Marlowe's, implied in "Kit drank deep," giving to understand that Kyd would be equally incontinent if he were able to find an outlet for his sex instinct. The conflation of the satisfaction of hunger into the gratification of sexual desire is again expressed through the figure of the goat, proverbial for its voracity as well as its lechery.

The sadism of Kyd's fantasy, as indicated above, views anal intercourse as an activity in which the active partner derives pleasure by inflicting pain on the passive one. As pleasure involves causing rather than experiencing pain, Kyd would seem to identify himself with the masculine role of the sodomite in his erotic fantasies, an identification underscored by the homophony of *Tom* with *tom*. The emphasis on making the passive partner suffer confers on the active partner the equally masculine role of the chastiser who disciplines the sodomite for his sexual deviance by submitting him to the same treatment he gives to his catamite, its most extreme expression being the barbarous parody of anal sex Skeres refers to. In this respect the gendering function of *Tom* acts as a check on the gender anarchy arising from the interchangeability of sexual roles in male-male sexual unions, here symbolised by the caprine associations acquired by *Kyd*. The term *goat*, with which the family name is tenuously connected, is even more of an epicene noun than *cat* in that it is modified by two gender markers, one to indicate each sex: *nanny* for a female goat, and *billy* for a male. As a surrogate gender

marker for *billy*, *Tom* symbolically contains the anarchic tendencies embodied in *Kyd* so that *Tom Kyd* becomes the site of the attempt to shore up a masculine identity within the unstable context of male homosexuality.

Kyd's oxymoronic homophobic homosexuality lexicalised in *Tom Kyd* has the effect of transforming Marlowe from an object of envy to one of desire. He does not desire to possess Marlowe, but rather to punish him for his irreverence, profligacy and success. The intermingling of sexual desire with the desire for revenge in turn brings about the transformation of *Tom Kyd* into *Tom Kit*, the new combination symbolising the focalisation of Kyd's punitive sodomy on Marlowe's disruptive homosexuality lexicalised in *Kit* following the semantic contagion undergone by the name on account of its formal relations with *cat*, *kind* and *know*. The thrust of Kyd's sadist-homosexual fantasy is the neutralisation of the disruptive passions of the disorderly unions Marlowe embodies. As he cannot chastise Marlowe physically, Kyd penetrates him symbolically by betraying him to the authorities. Ironically, Kyd himself suffers the same treatment meted out to the man he betrays: the would-be avenging sodomite is, again symbolically, reduced to the status of the chastised catamite by the very powers he wishes to serve.

7.3. Dissolving and Reconstituting Gender Roles in *Tom Walsingham*

The view Frizer takes of his master's liaison with Marlowe does not stand examination. Even the most cursory overview of their homosexual affair is sufficient to see that Walsingham does not consent passively to Marlowe's attentions, but rather positively incites him to make love to him. The inexperienced young man who succumbs to the solicitations of the heartless seducer consequently gives way to the *femme fatale*, the beautiful but heartless seductress who blandishes her physical charms to lure, enslave and finally destroy her unwary victim. The impression Walsingham makes on Marlowe on their first meeting, however, is more that of the lady of medieval romance, a role frequently assumed by the *femme fatale* to entice the unwary male and bring him under her control. The disparity between Marlowe's initial perception of Walsingham and the calculating, ruthless character behind that perception reactivates the etymological meaning of *Thomas*, this time to symbolise the clash of two contending feminine stereotypes embodied in Walsingham's duplicity *vis-à-vis* Marlowe, namely the restrained lady Walsingham is initially mistaken for and the pernicious siren he eventually reveals himself to be. The lady/siren dichotomy is inscribed in his demotic

full name, the form the Narrator uses most to refer to Walsingham, *Walsingham* being roughly identifiable with the positive feminine stereotype, and *Tom* with the negative one. Because of the latter identification, however, this inscription acts as an index to the lability of gender distinctions in that a male name is associated with a type of masculinised woman. Walsingham's role of *femme fatale* consequently effeminises him at the same time as it masculinises him in that the ruthlessness characterising the siren is the masculine virtue of resolution carried to its extreme (Munson Deats 1997: 14). In this light, *Tom Walsingham* symbolises the tenacity of prescribed gender roles despite their instability. In appropriating a masculine vice, the *femme fatale* transgresses gender distinctions in that it causes her to act in way that is unbecoming to her sex. Yet in being ruthless to good effect, she upholds gender distinctions in that her success reaffirms their validity. As regards Walsingham's part in the relationship, the homosexual affair with Marlowe caricatures the Platonic theory of the fall and rise of the human soul: the assumption of the role of Marlowe's lady represents his fall from masculinity, and the transition to the femme fatale impels his return to masculinity.

7.3.1. The Dubious Appropriacy of Tom

The first inkling of the inscription of the ambivalence regarding Walsingham's gender in *Tom* is found in his long-winded, self-pitying self-introduction:

> I am not anything save the most discardable of the Walsinghams. A younger son who does not inherit. Thomas, whose name taught him to doubt [p.31].

The allusion to his Biblical namesake, Thomas the twin, is on the face of it a declaration of Walsingham's cynically sceptical outlook on life. In this regard *Thomas* is an appropriate name in that the apostle who would not believe Christ had risen from the dead is proverbial for scepticism, as attested by the expression *doubting Thomas*. In attributing his sceptical temper to his name, Walsingham places the origin of his scepticism in language. While *whose* is co-referential with *Thomas*, which refers to the apostle, the referent of *name* is the linguistic token *Thomas*. It is not Thomas the twin that "taught him to doubt," *him* being co-referential with [*a*] *younger son who does not inherit*, but the name he bore, which would identify names as the ultimate source of Walsingham's scepticism. Underlying the identification of names as a cause for scepticism is the Platonic belief that existing naming conventions are malformed in that the names people are called by are inappropriate because they are not revelatory of their natures (see 2.1.4). As a byword for scepticism, *Thomas* may be an appropriate name

for Walsingham, but it does not follow that its familiar form is, which, owing to its homophony with *tom*, connotes masculinity.

The impression that *Tom* misidentifies its bearer as regards his gender identity comes across very strongly in the blazon when he is first presented:

> a young man of Kit's own age it seemed, lank locks of auburn parted and flowing, long face above a long body, so that Kit must needs look up at wide blue eyes and wide doubtfully smiling mouth, the white collar open at the girlish throat, hose wrinkled and points carelessly tied, a light dew on him as though he had come from tennis or fives. From him rose a faint odour of sweat and rose water [p.31].

Although it is the Narrator that is describing Walsingham, it is a description of him through Marlowe's eyes, casting the latter in the theoretically dominant masculine role of the beholder and Walsingham in the submissive feminine role of the object of the male beholder's gaze. Compared to the impression created by Marlowe's blazon, commented on in 6.2.1 and 6.2.2, Walsingham's effeminisation is more thorough because of the absence of masculine features to offset the feminine ones. His long hair, full mouth and slender figure are characteristics thought of as typically feminine. Above all, it is certain linguistic choices that clinch the effeminisation of the character described: the reference to his hair as *locks*, the description of his throat as *girlish*, and the euphemistic reference to an feature as unladylike as perspiration as a *light dew*. The overall impression given by the description is one of feminine delicacy and fastidiousness and coquettishness, qualities at variance with the masculinity conveyed by *Tom*.

The blazon, then, undermines the a priori assignation of gender roles on the strength of the acquired feline meanings of *Kit* and *Tom*. The co-occurrence of the familiar names in

> Kit and Tom consummated, in all gentleness, the love that could be spoken aloud not in the disguise of French or of Latin [p.62]

should disambiguate the sex act referred to. Marlowe is gendered feminine by virtue of the apophony of *Kit* with female *cat*, and Walsingham masculine by means of the homophony of *Tom* with *tom*, thereby identifying their relationship as a gender-marked male-male union which replicates the sexual roles that obtain in male-female unions. The assignation of roles suggested by the feline connotations of *Tom* and *Kit* is given the lie in

> Kit called *Mon amour, me voici* and ripped off the shirt as well as his own bloodied raiment. What he did then was more brutal than before, making Tom howl [p.55].

The participal clause *making Tom howl* bears unequivocal testimony that on this occasion it is Marlowe that penetrates his partner. From this instance one may deduce that it is Marlowe that takes the active masculine role in the relationship, especially in view of the thorough effeminisation undergone by Walsingham in the blazon.

Further evidence in support of Walsingham's effeminacy is provided by the combination of the non-onomastic co-homophone of his familiar name with *boy* to form *tomboy*. In early Modern England the compound is used as a cant term to denote a libidinous woman, and by extension prostitute (Partridge 1968 [1947]: 202; Williams 1994: 1401 III), the constituent *boy* alluding to her boisterous deportment during sex. Despite the masculine connotations carried by its constituents, the main effect of the compound would be to effeminise Walsingham if it were applied to him. The participle clause quoted from the excerpt above suggests that Walsingham has achieved an orgasm, its stridency identifying him with the uninhibited women which answers to the label of tomboy. The term *boy* itself might be interpreted as having an effeminising effect on account of the paederastic connotations it carries. Age-graded homosexual unions are also gender-marked ones in which the passive feminine role is invariably assumed by the younger partner, as attested by the ubiquity of *boy* in the early Modern English definitions of *Ganymede*, *catamite* and *ingle* collated in Bredbeck (1991: 18): "a boy 'loved for carnal abuse;' a boy 'hired to be abused contrary to nature;' a boy 'kept for Sodomy.'" Although *tomboy* effeminises Walsingham, then, the term nevertheless masculinises the women it is applied to so that, in the remit of his feminine role of Marlowe's lady, it attributes to him masculine qualities which become more pronounced when he assumes the role of femme fatale.

7.3.2. Walsingham*: the Positive Feminine Stereotype*

On his way to Dover, where he is to take ship to France, Marlowe passes through his home town, Canterbury, and pays a brief visit to his family there. Reminded of his future entry in the ministry, a prospect he has secretly decided to forgo, he procrastinates with

> I must become a Master of Arts, you know that. And till then a Walsingham man.
> —Walsingham? Anne said. That was a holy town, and the Milky Way in the sky showed the way to it [p.39].

His sister's confusing the family name for a place name prompts him to explain "who Walsingham was," Francis Walsingham, in whose employ Marlowe now is. Her

mistake draws attention to the double reading *Walsingham man* is susceptible of. Besides Francis Walsingham, the first bearer of the family name to come to mind as Marlowe is on a mission, the phrase is applicable to Thomas Walsingham. Marlowe considers himself not only as a servant to the former Walsingham, 'servant' being the meaning *man* has in this context, but to the latter as well, although in the second case his servitude is to be understood as a strong emotional bond rather than a contractual obligation.

The conception of love as servitude goes back to the medieval convention of courtly love whereby the poet-lover declares himself a vassal of his lady (Cuddon 1979: 164). The currency the feudal values of fealty and homage gains in heterosexual relationships brings about the fictional inversion of the habitual relation of power between the sexes: the lover surrenders masculine independence for feminine submission, allowing the lady an ascendancy over him she is otherwise debarred from. Instead of debasing him, the lover's subservience to his lady helps him to attain moral excellence by keeping his sexual desire for her in check until he has made himself worthy of her by carrying out whatever deeds she might desire him to do. In her capacity of a setter of tasks, the lady becomes the lover's mistress (Smith 1991: 258), a role Walsingham assumes when he invites Marlowe to dedicate verses to him with "[i]f you are a poet you may put together rhymes for me" [p.35]. The context in which Marlowe makes his covert declaration of service to Walsingham also contributes to the feudal setting in which their incipient relationship is framed. The mission to Rheims casts Marlowe in the role of the knight errant in search of deeds of derring-do to prove his worthiness to his beloved.

The tradition of courtly love conflates vassalage into the medieval cult of the Virgin Mary. The devotion for the mother of Jesus of Nazareth parallels the lover's acknowledgement of his lady as his liege, a parallel aided by the use of *Our Lady*, the title the consort of a feudal lord is styled by. The Marian associations of courtly love is precisely what connects the name *Walsingham* to this literary tradition. Looking back at the excerpt cited above, one notices that Anne Marlowe describes Walsingham as "a holy town," the adjective *holy* establishing a tenuous link between the name and the Virgin Mary. The exchange echoes an earlier one between Marlowe and Thomas Watson:

> More important, you shall see Sir Francis Walsingham.
> —Walsingham. A holy name. And he is what [p.12]?

In neither case are the connotations of holiness carried by *Walsingham* explained, although Anne Marlowe's mistake indicates that the source for these associations is a place and not a person. The final clarification comes in the interrogation Marlowe is subjected to on arriving at the English College in Rheims, the target of his first mission:

> —Are you a Walsingham man?
> —The shrine, you mean? There is no longer a shrine [p.45].

Marlowe's disingenuous reply to his interrogator's question alludes to the status of the priory at Walsingham as a place of Marian pilgrimages until the Reformation: hence the responses of "a holy name" and "a holy town." In the last exchange, Marlowe trades on the referential ambiguity of *Walsingham* as a multi-designatory name so that he can make out he has misunderstood the question. Instead of its intended meaning, 'a spy in the pay of Francis Walsingham,' he deliberately misinterprets *Walsingham man* as 'a votary of Our Lady of Walsingham.' Perversely, Marlowe may nevertheless be regarded as giving a truthful answer to the question in that he believes neither of the two definitions implied are applicable to him as regards his emotional loyalties. In his eyes he is a Walsingham man only in the sense that he is bound to a man of that name by the sexual passion its object arouses in him.

7.3.3. Tom*: The Negative Feminine Stereotype*

The confusion, genuine or feigned, as to what or who *Walsingham* refers to in the exchanges cited in the previous sub-section draws attention to the irony of a Protestant bigot bearing the same name as a site of Marian devotion. The associations of modesty and chastity the family name picks up from the place name render it an inappropriate name for the bigot's cousin as well, in view of the immodest and unchaste manner in which he subsequently conducts his relationship with Marlowe. The first inkling of Thomas Walsingham's immodesty is found in the blazon he is the object of, more specifically in "Kit must needs look up at wide blue eyes" [p.31]. Walsingham's gaze behaviour contrasts markedly to that displayed by Marlowe in the Narrator's blazon of him: "[Kit] evaded, as cats will, the straight gaze" [p.4]. To avert the gaze is to submit to, or acquiesce in, the unequal power relation underlying the non-reciprocity which characterises gaze behaviour between the lover and his beloved at the initial stage of courtship, and is approved of as a token of feminine propriety. To meet the gaze, on the other hand, is to refuse to let herself be dominated in that reciprocal gaze behaviour makes for an equal power relation: the beloved is objectified by the lover's gaze, but in

returning it, objectifies him as well. The refusal to submit herself to the male gaze is disapproved of as boldness, behaviour doubly improper to a lady in that boldness is the masculine virtue of intrepidness taken to its unacceptable extreme. What is worse, returning the gaze may well result in the reversal of prescribed gender roles whereby the beloved dominates the lover, as is the case with the *femme fatale* and her victim. The detail about meeting Marlowe's gaze, then, indicates that Walsingham is effeminised into the *femme fatale*, a masculinised feminine stereotype. He goes along with the objectification he undergoes in the blazon as a means of leading Marlowe on, but he does not submit himself to it.

According to the courtly tradition of medieval romance, carnal union is postponed until the lover has shown himself to be deserving of reciprocation of his desire for his lady, making for a prolonged courtship during which they are bound to remain celibate. Walsingham gives himself up to his lover as early as their second encounter, only days after they first meet. Moreover, although willing, Walsingham cannot be said to reciprocate Marlowe's sexual passion. The absence of reciprocity is clearly discernible in the Narrator's jaundiced rundown of their romance:

> If there had been in Tom Walsingham's brain a flame or even flicker of response to Kit's poetic ardency or the cunning of his learning, then there would have been other linkings and knottings and the joy of discourse in the cool of after love, but there was a great idleness, a pouting for praise though naught to praise [pp.141-2].

Sexual communion is not matched by a true marriage of minds or hearts, apparently because Walsingham's ignorance and vanity impedes a deeper and more intense involvement on his part. At first Marlowe is too infatuated with his partner to notice that sexual complaisance is offset by an emotional holding off. When he finally wakes up to Walsingham's coldness, Marlowe has grown too dependent on him to be able to break free from the hold his beloved has on him. From the very outset of the affair, then, Walsingham has Marlowe firmly under his control, thanks in part to the attraction he exerts on his lover. The lady Marlowe worships has metamorphosed into her polar twin, the *femme fatale* who manipulates him without compunction.

The most obvious manifestation of Walsingham's ascendancy over Marlowe is his arrogation of the right to decide when to have sex. The first invitation sets the tone for subsequent encounters:

> Shall we go?
> —Go where?

> —Oh Kit Kit Kit, you know where. To my inn and my room, whether the bed be made or not, with the door locked and our linen off for the heat. There are no spying eyes of London here. I could see in your gaze that day what you wanted, all hidden under your fine talk of Plato and Petronius [p.49].

The mock reproof of Marlowe's hypocrisy in dissimulating his desire for him is as much a flaunting of the power Walsingham has over him as an indulging in erotic banter in that it indicates that he knows what Marlowe wants. Conversely, just as he can assent to having sex, Walsingham can also exercise the female prerogative of holding off:

> Here we become two not one. Sleep. And as to point to their disunity [Walsingham] turned his back [p.182].

It is significant that Marlowe neither declines an invitation to sex nor demurs when his advances are turned down. Walsingham's hold on him is so complete as to annul the force of will Marlowe habitually exhibits to others, reducing him to a mere plaything. The one occasion on which Marlowe takes the initiative confirms than rather disputes the thrall in which he is held. The sexual assault on Walsingham referred to in 7.3.1 is attributable to amorous frenzy his desire drives him to. Barring this incident, Walsingham never has any problems in managing his otherwise unruly lover. The advantage he takes of Marlowe's love passion corroborates the Aristotelian view that *eros* makes for unequal relationships because it leads to the emotional subservience of one partner to the other, revealing egalitarian homosexual affairs to be a contradiction in terms.

Walsingham's enslavement of Marlowe confirms the Aristotelian misgiving about *eros*. Sexual passion makes for unequal relationships, particularly when it is one-sided. It places the person that experiences it at the mercy of his passionless object of desire, who, if he is unscrupulous as well as imperturbable, can use his partner's desire as a means of dominating him. Consequently, there is no such thing as an egalitarian male homosexual union, even though sexual roles are regularly exchanged. *Eros* can reverse the relation of power in gender-marked unions in the event that unrequited desire is felt by the partner who performs the dominant male role, just as it does in the heterosexual union of the femme fatale and her lover-victim. Whether their relationship is egalitarian or gender-marked, with Marlowe in the male role, his blind passion for Walsingham for all practical purposes places all power in the hands of the latter.

7.3.4. Tom *as an Instantiation of the Prowling-Cat Metaphor*

Given the lack of passion concealed behind Walsingham's intense sexual activity, the question inevitably arises of why, if he feels absolutely nothing for Marlowe, he enters into a love affair with him and carries it on, with prolonged intermissions, for a space of about eight years. The first clue as to the motives behind Walsingham's interest in Marlowe is furnished in the explanation he gives for following him to Rheims:

> We were in Paris, were we not, Frizer, and Frizer did not like Paris. We were waiting to spy on Poley, but Poley seemed to be there to start spying on us [p.48].

Like Marlowe, then, Walsingham is on a mission, an explanation which tallies with his sudden arrival at Francis Walsingham's London residence at Seething Lane when Marlowe was inducted into the Service, and the disclosure that his cousin "uses me at times" [p.31]. However, the story that he has been sent to France to keep an eye on Robert Poley loses credibility in the light of what Poley himself tells Marlowe on arriving in Calais. After crossing the Channel together, having rendezvoused in Dover, Marlowe expresses his surprise that he is to go on to Rheims by himself, to which Poley replies:

> —Fear not. There will be someone along. You shall not be alone. We are not fools in this business [p.45].

That someone is most probably Thomas Walsingham. The assurance that "[w]e shall meet, though, make no mistake of that" [p.35], made as Walsingham takes his leave from Marlowe at the end of their first meeting, would seem to lend support to this surmise, especially as the affirmation is made just as he is entering Francis Walsingham's office, presumably for a mission briefing. The assignment he is given is, it would seem, to keep the new agent under surveillance and ensure that he does not play them false and go over to enemy.

Thomas Walsingham's assurance that they shall meet again is inauspiciously echoed by Father Ballard's certainty of the existence of hell: "But make no mistake about damnation. When you die you go to hell and stay in hell forever" [p.57]. The priest's minatory reference to the torments of hell awaiting the unrepentant sinner bears directly on Marlowe's incipient affair with Walsingham insomuch as Ballard has the "most unnatural, iniquitous and beastly" sin of sodomy in mind when he predicts Marlowe's damnation (see 6.3.3). The prediction is eventually fulfilled, though not as Ballard thinks it will: it is not so much Marlowe's sexual orientation that brings about his

perdition as his desire for Walsingham. In his role of *femme fatale* Walsingham not only effects Marlowe's absolute submission but also his absolute destruction.

Again, a casual remark made at their first meeting helps to shed a little light on the true nature of Walsingham's relationship with Marlowe. At one point of the conversation Walsingham surprises Marlowe by repeating something that said on an earlier occasion:

> In youth is pleasure. (Kit started: someone, perhaps he himself, had said that previous day or night that seemed now much in the past) [p.33].

In fact it is Marlowe that uttered the aphorism the night before, at the supper party with the playhouse fraternity he had been invited to:

> —More, more, cried Kit. In youth is pleasure. Then, grinning like a fool, he stroked my unfeeding hand, which was to his right. Is it not so, you luscious Bel-Imperia that was [p.25].

What is surprising is that Walsingham was not at the party to hear Marlowe's drunken libation to youth. Surprising, but not inexplicable. Watson, who is also present at Marlowe's screening and Francis Walsingham's briefing at Seething Lane, was at the party he had organised to introduce Marlowe to playhouse fraternity, and consequently may well have informed both Walsinghams of his protégé's antics of the night before. This appears to be borne out at the lovers' encounter at Rheims, where Thomas Walsingham, with the insouciance which characterises him, names Watson as an informant on two occasions,

> [m]y grave cousin was mumbling Morley and Marley and Merlin, but Tom Watson said Kit was enough [p.48],

and

> Tom Watson said you were a pretty sort of fighter in taverns.

If Watson had told the Walsinghams about the fight Marlowe got involved in with a group of rowdies, it is not unreasonable to assume that he also told them of his drunken cavorting as well, including the cry of "[i]n youth is pleasure."

One other thing Watson is privy to and may have leaked to the Walsinghams is Marlowe's sexual orientation. This gives grounds to suspect that the encounter at Seething Lane has not come about by chance but has been carefully stage-managed. Thomas Walsingham blunders into his cousin's study precisely at the moment Marlowe is dismissed, and then is told to leave and wait until he is called in, allowing Marlowe

and Walsingham to become acquainted in the meantime. On this reading, Francis Walsingham, having been apprised of Marlowe's sexual orientation, orders his cousin to take the rookie agent under his wing in the knowledge that Marlowe will succumb to his charms, and as a result be more amenable to control. This would explain the perspicacity Thomas Walsingham demonstrates in describing Marlowe's Platonic defence of male-male love as "anatomising unnatural love" [p.33] (see 6.2.4.2): their causal encounter is a prolongation of Marlowe's screening so as to verify the disclosure of his homosexuality to Watson. Once this has been ascertained, Walsingham is appointed Marlowe's shadow. It is true that Walsingham seeks Marlowe out at Rheims, but he does so under orders.

Walsingham is a homosexual Mata Hari, a *femme fatale* with a licence to seduce. His admission that he has been "the object or recipient of verses" suggests not only his knowledge of, but also complicity in the objectification he is subject to. His concurrence in the dedication of verses suggests that provoking men to desire him forms part of the duties he must discharge for the Service. This, together with the fact that he is always in the know, intimates that Walsingham's status in the Service is much higher than the downtrodden helpmeet he has Marlowe believe him to be. Especially telling in this respect is the commendation Nicholas Faunt relays to Marlowe when he comes to fetch him for the Paris mission: "Walsingham speaks well of you. Both Walsinghams" [p.69]. To judge from the clarifying enlargement of the second sentence, Thomas Walsingham's opinions carry almost as much weight as his cousin's. The full extent of his importance emerges towards the end of *A Dead Man in Deptford*, when it transpires that he was sent on the embassy to Edinburgh with the express aim to bed King James in return for the extradition of a religious dissenter who had been granted asylum in Scotland. Male-male sex, then, is Walsingham's *métier*: he engages in it not out of wantonness, but as a means to an end. In Marlowe's case his job is to prevent backsliding or defection, as Walsingham himself admits on reuniting with Marlowe at Rheims: "I am ready to start spying on you. Or shall I say keeping you from trouble?" [p.48]. Once his lover is regarded as beyond the pale, Walsingham has no scruples about discarding him and leaving him to his fate. His hard-heartedness renders *Tom* an appropriate name for him after all. It identifies Walsingham as one of the predatory beings that constantly dog Marlowe and eventually hound him to his death.

7.3.5. Upwardly Social Mobility and Masculinisation

Walsingham's ascent from effeminacy to masculinity runs parallel with his transition from the "most discardable" to the "last of the Walsinghams" [p.200]. The turning point of his fortunes is the inheritance of the family estate from his elder brother. In terms of gender demarcation, his social ascension takes him away from ostensible feminine passivity to genuine masculine activity to the extent that it marks his entry into the public and political domain traditionally allocated to the male (Grogan 2002: 22), signalled by the assumption of masculine authority by virtue of his dignity as lord of the manor and his office as magistrate. As regards his relationship with Marlowe, Walsingham's recovery of gentlemanly rank causes their apparently egalitarian friendship to give way to an asymmetrical patron-client association. "Things are changed and changed mightily," as Frizer proclaims. "There is to be no more beastliness" [p.191].

The ban that rounds off Frizer's proclamation ostensibly announces the end of Marlowe's affair with the latter's master. His appointment as Walsingham's resident poet marks the resumption on a new footing of a relationship broken off some time before on Walsingham's initiative. When Marlowe takes up his post at Scadbury, his patron is in effect an old flame, someone one might still feel desire for that does not invite the attentions they once encouraged. The sexual abstinence characterising his return ironically does not prevent Marlowe from producing works noted for their homoeroticism: the sexually ambiguous epyllion *Hero and Leander*, and overtly homosexual tragedy *Edward II*. When the affair is resumed, again on Walsingham's initiative, it is conducted in such a way that it does not challenge the power structure which places the gentleman patron over his dependant. Walsingham's assumption of a public social role is matched by the adoption of an unambiguously active sexual role in his ongoing liaison with Marlowe. Socially, this is expressed through his appointment of Marlowe as his resident poet, an assertion of his newly acquired seigniorial prerogative to display the dignity of his station by including an artist of renown among his retainers. Consequently, Walsingham is no longer the object of the male gaze, as he was formerly: this is now redirected to the splendour of his patrimony, its *pièce de résistance* being its "most mellifluous" resident poet. The deflection of the gaze from the lord of manor to his distinguished protégé contributes to the commoditisation of Marlowe in that his new post reduces him to the status of the jewel of Walsingham's

crown. He is most striking of his patron's possessions, but a possession none the less, and therefore an object at the service of the latter's aggrandisement.

The proprietary relation established by Walsingham's patronage of Marlowe has the effect of definitively demarcating their respective sexual roles in their relationship. Although, as suggested in 7.3.1, *Kit* and *Tom* a priori assign passive and active sexual roles to their respective bearers, Walsingham's ostensible submission to Marlowe's admiring gaze strongly implies the contrary. As a result, references to their love-making such as "Kit and Tom consummated (...) the love that could be spoken aloud" are vague regarding their sexual roles despite the connotations of gender carried by their respective names. Significantly, the only explicit reference to who performed which role is made after Walsingham regains the social rank he lost to his elder brother. Called to Canterbury on business, he asks Marlowe to accompany him, and it is en route there that they resume their former intimacy, although

> [i]t was Tom that took all the dominant part, Kit yielding. Their reversal of roles forbidden by the Lord of the Manor and Kent magistrate, who shot his seed into a barren place as of the right of some ancient *jus* [pp.216-7].

The emphasis placed on *Tom* by the cleft sentence points up the novelty of the arrangement described. Either Walsingham has hitherto been Marlowe's catamite, or has taken turns with him in playing that role.

Walsingham's taking "all the dominant part," as the second sentence expressly declares, is dictated by his precedence over Marlowe in the social hierarchy, underscored by the feudal overtones of the final clause. That "the Lord of the Manor and Kent magistrate" should indulge in a homosexual romance with a dependant is an indiscretion which might be overlooked. What would be truly unconscionable is that a social inferior should assume the active role in their love-making. In insisting on penetrating Marlowe, Walsingham is not so much exercising a prerogative granted to him by virtue of his rank as discharging a duty incumbent on him in the interest of social stability. The abdication of the right to take "the dominant part" to a social inferior would be tantamount to relinquishing power, and therefore the first step towards the breakdown of the social order. Walsingham, according to the principle of *noblesse oblige*, should give out a clear signal of who is, quite literally, on top, even when engaged in so intimate an activity as sex.

The graphic assertion of his ascendancy over his lover points to a correlation between Walsingham's change in social status and the definition of his sexual role with

regard to Marlowe. His restored gentility and important office both oblige and empower him to assume and hold on to the active masculine role, bringing order to a hitherto disorderly union. The former absence of clear-cut roles has no disquieting social consequences as long as Walsingham is the non-inheriting younger son of a gentleman. Once gentleman status has been restored to him, the homosexual affair with Marlowe must be reconstituted to imitate the heterosexual model of fixed masculine and feminine roles if it is to be accommodated in the situation arising from Walsingham's new position in the social hierarchy.

7.3.6. The Restoration of Masculinity through Matrimony

From its very inception the relationship follows a double, bi-directional trajectory. As Walsingham is increasingly masculinised, so Marlowe is effeminised, *masculine* and *feminine* here being synonymous with *dominant* and *dominated* respectively. Walsingham is progressively raised from objectified lady, task-setting mistress to lord and master. It is true that he is called *master* by his manservant Frizer, but it is not until Walsingham takes possession of Scadbury that the term comes fully into its own. Until then the title is used with the meaning of "[o]ne who employs another in his service" (OED 1989 VI: 212), in converse relation to the term *servant*. Once Walsingham is installed as the owner of Scadbury, *master* takes on the more stately meanings of "[a] man having control or authority" and "[o]ne having direction or control over the action of another or others" (OED 1989: 211 VI). As a magistrate Walsingham has control over the public affairs of the area under his jurisdiction, and as Marlowe's patron he has control over his dependant's freedom of action.

In becoming Walsingham's lover, Marlowe, like the servant-knight of courtly romance, forgoes independence for servitude, a servitude that becomes more onerous on taking up the post offered him. In becoming Walsingham's resident poet, he also assumes the discarded role of mistress, although in the sexual sense of 'kept woman,' contributing to the further effeminisation of Marlowe. The pejorative change undergone by *mistress* as the term is passed from patron to client is educed by Walsingham's bombshell, dropped at Marlowe's return from his summons to the Privy Council to answer allegations of atheism made against him by his former colleague and rival Thomas Kyd:

> I shall marry soon. I think you have guessed that, I need the dowry. You would have to go, but I did not think your departure would be enforced by the Privy Council [p.249].

Walsingham's impending marriage would make Marlowe his mistress in the sense of a woman that illicitly occupies the place of a wife in the event he stayed on. Worst of all, since the announcement does duty as an invitation to leave, Marlowe is a discarded mistress, sacrificed for the sake of domestic harmony and with no right of redress.

Matrimony marks Walsingham's definitive reconciliation with the masculine values he has waived for so long, even if it is entered on for monetary gain. As "the last of the Walsinghams" it is incumbent on him, as he flippantly puts it, to "wed and beget an heir that shall beget heirs and so to the end of time" [p.200]. The continuation of the family name is primarily a male concern insofar as the name is perpetuated through patrilinear transmission as a means of ensuring permanent male control of society. Above all marriage represents the culmination of Walsingham's return to the higher regions of masculinity after his fall into effeminacy. His apotheosis, however, takes place after Marlowe's death, as witnessed by the Narrator:

> I saw Thomas Walsingham knighted and married to a wife who grew much in favour with the Queen of the Scotch slobberer that was less of a man than the irritable harridan he replaced [p.269].

Knighthood and marriage represent the pinnacle on which upwardly mobile social and gender identities converge. The full recovery of his masculine identity through marriage renders Walsingham worthy of the title *master* in yet another sense, that of self-mastery. His ability to swing both ways at will denotes a firm control over his impulses regarded as masculine, in contrast to Marlowe, who becomes a slave first to his passions, and then to those who manipulate him through them.

The obverse to Walsingham's return to the masculine fold is Marlowe's complete exclusion from it. The loyalty Walsingham must now pledge his prospective spouse absolves him from the obligations he owes Marlowe as his friend and patron, depriving his dependant of the place he has hitherto held in his household. The callously cynical advice Walsingham gives his departing friend, "[y]ou can lecture on divinity abroad" [p.249], drives home the gravity of Marlowe's predicament: if he has no place at Scadbury, he has no place anywhere. To a large extent his retirement to Walsingham's estate is a response to a growing sense of alienation from a world which has gradually frozen him out. Estranged from his family because of his homosexuality, separated from his colleagues of the playhouse fraternity on account of his too innovative approach to drama, at odds with his colleagues of the Service owing to his political unreliability, and under investigation for his supposed atheism, Marlowe has no one else to turn to but

Walsingham, who has also had a part to play in his alienation. Deprived of the sanctuary Scadbury offers him, Marlowe is reduced to the sodomite as the universal outcast described by Bray (1982: 25). The prodigal son, the misunderstood artist, the burnt-out case and the religious dissident are not, like sodomy, "conceived of as part of the created order at all," but "part of its dissolution," and so to be rooted out and destroyed.

7.4. Recapitulation

The focus of this chapter has been on the extension of the feline conceit via the homophony *Tom* with the masculine gender marker *tom* in excerpt [13], "all these Toms, a world of toms like a night roof top." By virtue of its pronounced multi-designatory character, indicated by the pluralisation of both the name and its non-onomastic co-homophone, *Tom* highlights the singularity of *Kit*, which in turn draws attention to the uniqueness of its bearer's anachronistic awareness of his sexual identity. By virtue of its masculine gender, established by its status as a male name and its semantic contagion from *tom*, *Tom* genders *Kit* feminine, thereby effeminising the male bearer of the latter name. The nocturnal setting of the excerpt brings out the feral associations of felinity, characterising the referents of *toms* as predatory creatures that stalk a solitary prey, and giving rise to a new feline framing metaphor, the prowling-cat metaphor. The identification of *Tom* with feline rapacity has the effect of refining the multiple feline connotations attached to *Kit* by virtue of its apophony with *cat*. The feral connotations of *Tom* help to narrow down the numerous, and often contradictory, qualities ascribed to cats by commonplace beliefs regarding these animals, concretely to associations of sensuality, impotence and vulnerability. Consequently, the gendered *Tom/Kit* binarism defines itself in the dichotomies of wanderer/stalker, predator/prey, powerful/powerless and dominant/dominated. The effeminisation of Marlowe is therefore interpretable in terms of an asymmetrical power relation in which he is the weaker member, traditionally the role the female is cast into.

Multiple designations are a potential source of referential ambiguity. With so many characters called *Tom* confusion may arise as to which bearer is referred to whenever the name is used. To some extent the night-time setting of excerpt [13] makes reference to the difficulties of distinguishing those who wish Marlowe ill from those who do not, as well as the inscrutability of those he comes across in the course of his career. The singling out of the "three Toms in his London life" mentioned in excerpt [15] sidesteps the referential problems posed by multiple designation, though not the problems related

to the designs they may have on Marlowe. Above all his relationships with Thomas Kyd, Thomas Watson and Thomas Walsingham problematicise the role of sexual attraction in male-male bonds through the contrast of the Platonic inclusion of *eros* with the Aristotelian exclusion, recast in terms of the sodomy/friendship dichotomy. Drawing on the etymological meaning of the common forename, the relationships with Walsingham and Watson reflect the antithetical yet symmetrical relation of sodomy with male friendship brought about by the capacity of the former to ape the latter. On account of his acknowledged homosexuality, Marlowe is typecast, in the second relationship, into the role of the sodomite who allegedly seduces Walsingham and leads him astray. Although the association with Kyd is definable as neither friendship nor sodomy, it is destabilised by an undercurrent of homoerotic desire sublimated into a species of cathartic sado-sodomy that purges him of his unconfessable passions through the edifying spectacle of deserved punishment given to the sexual deviant.

Ironically, it is the intensely sexed-up sodomitical union with Walsingham that effectively neutralises the perceived threat posed by the sodomite. From the very inception of their liaison Walsingham has Marlowe firmly in his power, first as the latter's lady, then as his mistress, and finally as his patron, a progression that leads him out of his initial effeminacy to masculinity, culminating in the marriage reported in the Narrator's epilogue. It is also in the homosexual affair that the influence exerted by *Tom* on the definition of the felinity conveyed by *Kit* can be seen at first hand, notably in the mutation of the feline metaphors that frame Marlowe. The meeting with Walsingham marks the transition from the wandering-cat to the maltreated-cat metaphor: as Marlowe falls deeper under his beloved's spell, he is alternately petted and put upon until he is finally let loose. The correlates to Robert Poley's stroking and squeezing the cat on his lap (see 5.3.2) are Walsingham's consent to have sex and the uncountable petty humiliations he subjects his lover to. The struggling-cat metaphor also comes into play during his emotional thraldom, more specifically on the occasions Marlowe tries to break off their relationship. Such attempts invariably prove to be as ineffectual as the struggling of Kett's cat to free itself from his arms (see 5.3.1): whenever Marlowe walks out him, Walsingham seeks him out and invariably charms him into resuming their liaison. When the relationship is finally terminated, it is Walsingham that brings it to an end, a clear demonstration of his ascendancy over Marlowe. As he becomes increasingly alienated from his associates, and as he comes under more and more pressure from his colleagues in the Service, the wandering-cat metaphor gradually

merges into the drowning-cat metaphor. Towards the end of the novel Marlowe's to-ing and fro-ing takes on the form of a frantic search for safety as he feels the dragnet drawing close on him. When he is finally turned out of Scadbury, the only place to resort to is Deptford, where he is stabbed to death, possibly with the connivance of his erstwhile friend.

The part played by Walsingham in the breaking of Marlowe links him to his two namesakes, who in varying degrees also share some responsibility in the final downfall of their mutual friend. In descending order of gravity, Kyd must shoulder part of the blame for Marlowe's violent death. In denouncing his associate's alleged atheism to the authorities, Kyd sets in motion the train of events that will culminate in the killing at Deptford Strand so that he is twinned to Walsingham by their joint guilt for Marlowe's unhappy fate. Both Kyd and Walsingham are guilty, although there are mitigating circumstances in the former case. Arrested in the course of a government clampdown against seditious writing, and questioned under torture on the anti-Arian tract found among the papers confiscated at the time of his arrest, Kyd not only shifts all responsibility for its authorship to Marlowe. To avoid further torture, and perhaps death on the gallows, he blackens Marlowe's character by making him out to be an atheist of the worst stamp that uses the slightest pretext to air his impious views. Walsingham cannot claim that is either him or Marlowe. He turns Marlowe out in the full knowledge that he is effectively throwing him to the wolves, not to mention the possible awareness that his former lover will soon be murdered, as his murderer is none other than Walsingham's servant Ingram Frizer, and the Deptford meeting is arranged at Scadbury. Watson's connection with the events at Deptford Strand is more tenuous. It is through his mediation that Marlowe is able to embark on his twin careers of playwright and spy which will eventually lead to his undoing, largely because it introduces his protégé to the two men who will betray him. Although Watson cannot be held responsible for the betrayal of Marlowe by his namesakes, especially as this supervenes after Watson's death, he is guilty of disclosing information about Marlowe which will later offer Walsingham leverage over Marlowe, particularly as regards the subject's sexual orientation. Watson's collusion with the Walsinghams therefore gives grounds to suspect that he is not such a good friend to Marlowe after all. On balance, then, there is reason to suppose that each of the "three Toms" in Marlowe's life is framed by the predatory connotations carried by their name.

PART TWO

8. Fair is Foul

In the Narrator's greeting in the opening sentence of the prologue, and his leave-taking in the closing sentence of the epilogue, the Reader is styled "fair or foul reader" [pp.3 & 269]. Going along with the fiction that *A Dead Man in Deptford* is a seventeenth-century manuscript, and that its target reader is a contemporary of its purported author, the wording of the addresses would constitute a gross breach of what Sell (1991: 221) calls selectional politeness, the avoidance of saying anything which might cause offence. According to the literary etiquette of early Modern England, *reader* ought to have been modified only by *fair*, one of the many honorific epithets used in vocative addresses to one gentleman from another (Replogle 1987 [1973]: 174). The co-occurrence of *foul* not only cancels out whatever deference may have been conveyed by *fair*, it also casts doubt on the integrity conferred on the addressee by the honorific. In terms of instrumental politeness, which Sell (1991: 209) identifies with the goal-oriented politeness described by Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987), the Narrator's discourtesy affronts the Reader's face, the public self-image he seeks to project and expects the Narrator to uphold (Allan and Burridge 1991: 238). Whether selectional or instrumental, politeness has a direct bearing on the survey on naming practices in Burgess's novel, not least because of the role assigned by Brown and Levinson (1987: 107-10) to forms of address in their account of positive politeness strategies, that is, politeness strategies that seek to enhance the addressee's public self-image.

Besides politeness, the salutatory and valedictory addresses touch on issues related to language-as-a-system and how it is constituted. The flouting of selectional politeness is so blatant and barefaced as to foster the suspicion that there is more to the affront than a disregard of politesse. This suspicion is strengthened by the literary associations triggered by "fair or foul reader," suggesting that the real object of the departure from literary etiquette is to alert the reader to the sources alluded to and, more importantly, the linguistic insights they contain. The Narrator's impoliteness is, on this interpretation, a foregrounding device designed to shock the reader into paying more attention to the address forms to discover their literary provenance and the linguistic issues raised there, particularly as regards the more complex salutatory address, "fair or foul reader, but where's the difference?"

On tracing the verbal echoes of the address to their sources, the first allusion to come to mind will probably be the first line of the rhyming couplet which closes the opening scene to *Macbeth* (I i 10-1):

Fair is foul, and foul is fair:
Hover through the fog and filthy air,

The second, and comparatively more recondite, allusion is "Fair is too foul an epithet for thee," the first line of the tribute Tamburlaine pays to his consort Zenocrate, referred to through the personal pronoun *thee*, in *1 Tamburlaine* (V ii 70). Although they have excited considerably less interest among students of language, the excerpts just cited bear on the issue of linguistic arbitrariness as much as "[w]hat's in a name?" does. In the former two extracts, however, arbitrariness is related to another key feature of language, namely binarity. Both arbitrariness and binarity are identifiable with two opposing principles within the language system, each of which may be termed the disorderly and orderly tendency respectively. As a structural principle of language (Wales 1989: 49), binarity strains towards order and balance; but, as will be shown, the dyads set up by the principle are subject to constant redefinitions on account of the arbitrary nature of the meanings assigned to the paired elements. The problematic concerning these two tendencies is stated explicitly in the salutation: the disjunctive conjoin "fair is foul" is an informal notation of the orderly principle of binarity, whereas the question "but where's the difference?" appended to the greeting alludes to the disorderly principle of arbitrariness and the disruptive effect it has.

8.1. The Linguistic Implications of "fair or foul reader"

The linguistic implications of the sources of the excerpts from *Macbeth* and *Tamburlaine* anticipate how the principle of binarity is problematicised in *A Dead Man in Deptford*. The adjectives *fair* and *foul* are an instance of antonymy, a choice between two terms with mutually exclusive meanings. Choice between two mutually exclusive elements is the definition Wales (1989: 49) gives of binarity, which makes antonymy the semantic exponent of binarity (Crystal 1991 [1980]: 20; Bussmann 1996 [1990]: 26). Since antonymy operates on the principle of binarity, the disruption of the semantic opposition between *fair* and *foul* in the extracts under review subverts the general principle underlying their antonymous relation as well. The review of the fragments will therefore centre on how antonymous relations are destabilised, concretely through the polysemy exhibited by the antonyms, the dissociation of their evaluative content from their linguistic form, and the disparity in their application. As preliminary to the examination, a brief account of the relation between *fair* and *foul*

will be given with a view to identifying the features that distinguish it from other types of semantic opposition.

8.1.1. Evaluative Polarity

Considered as synonyms of *good* and *evil*, expressive of the most pervasive of dichotomies (Wales 1989: 49), the antonym pair formed by *fair* and *foul* constitutes the paradigm case of what Cruse (1992: 301) calls evaluative polarity. The use of evaluative polar terms ―be they adjective pairs like *fair* and *foul*, noun pairs like *friend* and *foe*, or verb pairs like *love* and *hate*― are instances of committed language, that is, they are indicative of the speaker's attitude towards what is being spoken about. The selection of one term, in this case *fair*, conveys a favourable value judgement of what is being described, whereas its opposite, *foul*, communicates an unfavourable valuation. Evaluative polarity, as Sedgwick (1990: 9-10) says of cultural binary oppositions, is an asymmetrical relation in which one term of the dyad is subordinated to its partner. Accordingly, *foul* means 'inferior to fair' as well as 'not fair,' identifying evaluative polarity in terms of preference. In using an evaluative polar term, the speaker is not so much distinguishing as discriminating: in favour of the entity under discussion when the preferred term is applied, or against it when the non-preferred one is employed.

Evaluative polarity is not equivalent to the polar opposition described in Leech's account of the gradable antonymy (1981 [1974]: 100-2). In this account the terms of the antonym pair, *large* and *small*, are envisaged as occupying each half of a scale, or area of purport (Cruse 1992: 296), in which the property described by each term is presented as 'more or less large' and 'more or less small.' The degree to which an entity possesses the property attributed to it is indicated by modifying the adjective that describes that property by adverbs that either enhance its descriptive content (*completely*, *extremely*, *very*, etc.) or attenuate it (*a bit*, *fairly*, *slightly*, etc.). The enhancing of descriptive content is divergent in that it places the antonym nearer the extreme of its area of purport, particularly when the intensifier indicates possession of the attribute to a noteworthy degree. The attenuation of descriptive content, by contrast, is convergent in that it places the antonym nearer to the divide of the two areas of purport, a no-man's-land in which the description 'neither large nor small' obtains. As is the modification of *foul* by *too* in the excerpt from *Tamburlaine* shows, *fair* and *foul* are gradable as well. Unlike *large* and *small*, however, the evaluative polar terms are graded on separate

though overlapping scales, a "merit scale" for the preferred antonym, and a "badness scale" for the non-preferred one (Cruse 1992: 301). The opposition between *fair* and *foul* is therefore a privative one whereby the antonyms are defined by the presence of a semantic feature in the one term, and its absence in the other. Accordingly, if the semantic feature is [good], then *fair* and *foul* are identified respectively as the marked and unmarked terms of the opposition.

The evaluative polar opposition epitomised by *fair* and *foul* differs from the polar opposition exemplified by *large* and *small* in two ways. First, the latter type of semantic contrast does not involve the subordination of one term to the other, at least when used in their non-figurative senses. To describe, say, a building as "large" or "small" is committed insomuch as it involves hazarding a guess, but uncommitted as regards valuation, as large or small size are neither good nor bad in themselves. Second, the opposition between *large* and *small* is gradable insofar as the adjectives share the same scale, over against the categorical either/or contrast between *fair* and *foul* due to their gradability on separate scales. Nevertheless, the figurative uses of *large* and *small*, as in the compound adjectives *large-* and *small-minded*, point to a bias in favour of big at the expense of small size. Cruse's labelling of the areas of purport for the *long/short* polar opposition as *supra* and *sub* (1992: 298) go to show just how internalised this bias is. *Long* and *short*, defined as supra- and sub-terms respectively, are dimensional cohorts of *large* and *small*, with the result that largeness is "above," and therefore "superior to," smallness. No binary opposition, as Fowler (1986: 27) contends, is wholly impartial: one term is always privileged over the other. Neither, as Sedgwick (1990: 10) would add, are they fixed and constant: the simultaneous exclusion and subordination of one term by the other makes for the instability of the relation in that it renders the non-preferred term as "at once internal and external" to the preferred one.

8.1.2. The Polysemy of fair *and* foul

Returning to the citations from Shakespeare and Christopher Marlowe, one is likely to be struck by the variety of meanings borne by *fair* and *foul* on reading the two excerpts in unison. While in Tamburlaine's rhapsody the adjectives signify 'pleasing to behold' and 'displeasing to hear' respectively, in the Weird Sisters' rhyme their meanings vary according to context in which they are considered. The reference to "the fog and filthy air" in the matching line invests the antonyms with the meteorological meanings of 'clear' and 'misty,' an assignment of meaning underscored by the alliteration of *fog*

and *filthy* with *fair* and *foul*. In the echoic comment "[s]o foul and fair day I have not seen" (*Macbeth* I iii 38) these meanings are elided into 'auspicious' and 'inauspicious' on the one hand, and 'beneficial' and 'prejudicial' on the other. As the tragedy unfolds, and Macbeth commits one crime after the other, the adjectives take on the moral meanings 'admissible' and 'inadmissible,' which conflate with, and eventually supersede, the meanings they previously conveyed. Besides tracing the downfall of Shakespeare's tragic hero, the changes in meaning undergone by *fair* and *foul* attest to their polysemy, rounded off by the aesthetic meanings with which they are used in the extract *Tamburlaine*.

The multiple meanings of *fair* and *foul* evidenced in the excerpts would suggest polysemy belongs to the disorderly element of language. A one-to-many relationship between form and content certainly leads to ambiguity (Ullman 1971: 143), as can be appreciated in the couplet from *Macbeth*. Viewed in isolation, it is not clear whether the antonym pair is meant to signify 'clear' and 'misty,' 'auspicious' and 'ominous,' 'beneficial' and 'prejudicial' or 'admissible' and 'inadmissible,' or whether all four sets of meanings are intended. On reflection, however, the instances of multiple meaning enumerated underwrite rather than undermine binarity, even though it is a source of ambiguity. Each meaning of *fair* is invariably matched by an antonymous meaning of *foul*, indicating that polysemy, while disrupting, does not bring about the dissolution of antonymy, but rather upholds its underlying principle through the multiplication of established semantic oppositions, or their transformation into new oppositions. Just as Thomas Walsingham's bisexuality signals the pliability of masculinity in face of sexual desire, so polysemy signals is the resilience of antonymy, and by implication binarity, in the face of semantic instability. Judging by the antonymy of *fair* and *foul*, the defining features of binarity may be identified as being permanence and pliability. Indeed, binarity may well owe its permanence to its pliability, the property which enables a binary semantic opposition to metamorphose into another one.

Further, the polysemy of *fair* and *foul* can be attenuated by subsuming all the paired meanings under the dyad formed by 'good' and 'evil.' Accordingly 'clear,' 'auspicious,' 'beneficial' and 'admissible' are bound to 'good' by a relation akin to hyponymy, and by the same token 'misty,' 'ominous,' 'prejudicial' and 'inadmissible' go under 'evil.' In like manner, 'pleasing' and 'displeasing,' the meanings with which the adjectives are used in Tamburlaine's oration, may be subsumed under 'good' and 'evil' respectively to the extent that what pleases earns approval and is therefore "good," and what displeases

earns disapproval and is therefore "evil." In view of this subsuming of the various meanings of *fair* and *foul* under a single superordinate semantic opposition, and for the sake of clarity of exposition, 'good' and 'evil' will be the only meanings to be considered in the remainder of the review of the two excerpts.

8.1.3. The Dissociation of Form from Content

The semantic ambiguity arising from the polysemy of *fair* and *foul* is in part traceable to the arbitrary nature of the association of their evaluative content with their respective forms. As there is no objective correspondence between *fair* and 'good,' the relation between signifier and signified is prone to constant redefinitions that lead to the acquisition of new nuances, as evidenced by the senses 'admissible,' 'auspicious,' 'beneficial' and 'pleasing' for *good*.

Arbitrariness is discussed in some detail in the introductory chapter of the first part of this thesis, centred on the allusion to "What's in a name?" The issue of arbitrariness is also raised in Tamburlaine's rhetorical complaint of the inadequacy of *fair* to describe Zenocrate's comeliness, although bringing a different perspective to bear on the principle. A careful reading of the line reveals the phrasing of the Scythian warlord's dissatisfaction with the hackneyed literary adjective for feminine beauty involves the same operation as that discerned in Juliet's observation on the negligible effect a change of denomination would have on the qualities of a rose. Not only is the relation of *epithet* with *Fair* an example of the text deixis instantiated by *name* and *rose*, the first term of each pair are also umbrella terms denoting a class of linguistic expressions: nouns in the case of *name*, and adjectives in the case of *epithet*. Nevertheless, although the same operation is performed in each case, it is carried out on a different type of association. Whereas Juliet's lament exposes the arbitrary nature of the relation between a linguistic expression and its referent, Tamburlaine's suit highlights the arbitrary nature of the relation between the form and content of a linguistic expression. Tamburlaine's fulsome praise of his consort's beauty, in other words, illustrates arbitrariness as defined by Saussure, although it is as forceful argument for linguistic arbitrariness as Juliet's wistful complaint.

As the referent of *epithet*, a noun denoting the lexical class it belongs to, *Fair* occurs in hypostasis, that is, as a citation form. The adjective's status as a linguistic expression mentioned qua a linguistic expression is foregrounded by the instance of hypallage contained in the line from *Tamburlaine*. *Epithet* is modified by *foul* so that, by virtue of

the noun's reference to *Fair*, the adjective pre-modifying it is in effect qualifying its antonym, although what is described as "foul" is the linguistic token *Fair*, not the quality it describes. The covert qualification of an adjective by its antonym is a trope to show up the failure of a literary cliché to do justice to either Zenocrate's beauty or the profound impact it has on her suitor. However, the assertion that *fair* falls short of its task of evoking comeliness throws into relief not only its separateness from the quality it conventionally describes, but also the arbitrary nature of their association. The oxymoron underlying the anaphora between *Fair* and *epithet* underscores the separation of the evaluative content from the adjective effectuated through the relation between the two terms.

The implications of the anaphoric relation of *epithet* with *Fair* on the one hand, and the oxymoronic relation of *Fair* with *foul* on the other, are worked out in the first line of the Weird Sisters' rhyme. The line in question consists of two co-ordinated equational clauses with identical but transposed elements, *fair* and *foul*, making each clause a mirror image of the other. The transposition of the antonyms and the relation of equivalence imposed on them in each case by the copula encourage the interpretation that the adjectives have exchanged their evaluative content so that they signify the exact opposite of their conventional meanings. The reversal of meanings effectuated by the double equation of *fair* and *foul*, in other words, follows up Juliet's pronouncement on linguistic arbitrariness by detaching the evaluative content from each adjective and transferring it to their antonym, seemingly carrying out what is merely contemplated in Juliet's soliloquy.

To represent the Weird Sisters' act of lexical transvestism adequately the line must be amended. First, the subjects of each clause would have to be italicised so that they might be recognised as citation forms, and second, the subject complements would have to be enclosed in single inverted commas to indicate, in keeping with the convention adopted in this thesis, their status as the signified-s of the italicised items. These amendments made, the line would read

> *Fair* is 'foul', and *foul* is 'fair,'

so as to make explicit the signifier-signified associations beneath the subject-complement relations of each clause and reveal thereby the exchange of descriptive content causing the antonyms to describe the opposite qualities they conventionally signify. On this interpretation, the three Witches' incantation is far from being a piece of

doggerel, but constitutes a wilful act of rebellion in the linguistic sphere insofar as the transposition of *fair* and *foul* expresses the reversal of established semantic categories.

8.1.4. Contradictory Applications of fair *and* foul

The inversion of meaning suggested by the transposition of *fair* and *foul* can be put down to different applications of the adjectives, a reading borne out by Macbeth's subsequent rise and fall. His fateful encounter with the Weird Sisters begins with the remark "[s]o foul and fair day I have not seen," amplifying as well as echoing "[f]air is foul, and foul is fair" (see 8.1.1). Since the prophecy revealed to him prompts the hitherto loyal general to murder his liege lord and seize the throne, the chiasmus underscores the truism that what is beneficial to some is detrimental to others. While the fog that enshrouds the Blasted Heath assists the Weird Sisters in their design to corrupt Macbeth by causing him to come to them, for their victim the fog is a hindrance because it causes him to lose his way. Because of these differences in appreciation, the fog can be simultaneously described as "fair" and "foul," ironically confirming the general's remark just before coming across the three Witches.

The contradictory uses of *fair* and *foul* are attributable to differing evaluations of the entity described. Evaluation in turn entails the existence of a set of settled assumptions and beliefs against which the entity that is evaluated is benchmarked preparatory to its valuation. Leech (1981 [1974]: 101) identifies two basic types of norm, object-related and subject-related. An object-related norm is one invoked by the entity to be described. Accordingly, *fair*, with the meaning 'comely,' calls forth a different set of assumptions when applied to a child than when applied to marriageable female in that the comeliness perceived in the former lacks the element of sexual attraction bound up with the beauty of the latter. As choice of antonym is the result of a prior evaluation, there is a strong element of subjectivity involved in the giving of descriptions. Tamburlaine's assertion that Zenocrate is the fairest of all women is an example of the application of a subject-related norm, a set of opinions which are true for him but not necessarily for others. For Bajazeth, one of the numerous potentates Tamburlaine subdues, this honour will most likely go to his consort Zabina instead of Zenocrate, who in the eyes of the Turkish emperor may only be passably fair, just plain or even hideous. Their disagreement over who is to be adjudged the fairest of women is attributable to the existence of separate norms concerning how females should appear.

In the light of the preceding discussion on subject-related norms, "[f]air is foul, and foul is fair" may be construed as the negative valuation of the applications of the antonyms according to one norm by a competing norm. On this interpretation, *fair* means 'foul' when the adjective is felt to have been misapplied, that is, applied to an entity described as *foul* by the norm violated by the application of the adjective. For the Weird Sisters the murder of King Duncan is "fair" because it fulfils their sinister designs, but for his loyal vassals regicide is an act of unspeakable infamy that goes against the universal and social order, and as a result "foul." To make it a more explicit expression of the disparity attending uses of *fair* and *foul*, the Weird Sisters' line needs to be expanded by appending "for some but not others" to each clause so that it reads:

> *Fair* is 'foul' for some but not others, and *foul* is 'fair' for some but not others.

With this final amendment the instability displayed by the antonyms is shown to be attributable as much to the subjectivity of their users as a propensity to change their meanings.

8.2. Binarity and the Polemical Nature of the Memoir

In the light of the linguistic insights offered by the literary allusions it triggers, the salutatory address constitutes the template for the tension between the orderly principle and disorderly element of the fictional memoir on Marlowe. The disjunctive conjoin "fair or foul" both epitomises binarity by explicitly offering a choice between two alternatives and announces its role as a key structuring principle of the Narrator's discourse. Indeed, the abundance of binary structures is such that reading the book is to a large extent a sustained exercise in opting for one of the alternatives offered. The first choice, after that between *fair* and *foul*, is whether to interpret "but where's the difference?" as a genuine or rhetorical question. Whichever construction placed on it, however, the answer invariably leads to a dead end. If it is interpreted as a straight question, the Reader either comes up with the trite answer that *fair* is 'not foul' and vice versa, or is forced to confess ignorance like the Narrator. If, on the other hand, it is read as a rhetorical question, it becomes an affirmation that there is no difference between the antonyms or, if there is, an admission that there is no way of telling what that difference consists in. Although not repeated, the question is understood every time a binary contrast occurs, with the same destabilising effect. As a consequence of the impossibility of giving a satisfactory answer, the binary contrasts present

throughout the narrative emerge as men of straw: they are set up with the express purpose to be interrogated if not knocked down. In such a scenario the reader is not so much invited as challenged to make a choice.

To invite or challenge the Reader to make choices is to involve him as a participant in the Narrator's relation of Marlowe's life. The relation is consequently to be understood as discourse, in the interpersonal and transactional sense of an exchange initiated by the Narrator and taken up by the Reader (Leech & Short 1981: 146). The involvement of the Reader in the development of the narrative entails an extension of the scope of binarity. To begin with, the discourse he is drawn into eventually reveals itself to be suasive in character. The Narrator is not just giving an account of Marlowe's life; he is posthumously pleading his case before an audience prejudiced against him by the notoriety the dramatist gained as a sexual deviant and religious dissident. The pro-Marlowe stand taken by the Narrator confronts, and defines itself against, the broad anti-Marlowe position built on a sustained discursive practice of labelling him a "foul bugger" and "mad scoffing" atheist. The Narrator's advocacy of Marlowe therefore places his memoir within the dialectic of opposing discourses, discourse understood in the Foucaultian sense of a rhetorical imposition which defines an object through the regularity of various statements which not only describes that object, but also delimits what can be said about it and identifies those who has authority to speak about it (Cook 1987 [1973]: 64). Since it involves the clash of two contrasting positions, dialectic is binary in character so that the expression and subsequent interrogation of binarity in the Narrator's memoir runs through the entire discourse situation in which it is situated.

The dialectical nature of the Narrator's discourse becomes apparent in the conflicting versions of Marlowe's death given at the end of his relation. The juxtaposition of the Narrator's account of the Deptford affray with the inquest findings reveals them to be mirror images of one another. While there is broad agreement over the circumstances of the incident they report —that Marlowe, Robert Poley, Nicholas Skeres and Ingram Frizer meet at Widow Bull's, where they spend the day in conversation and dining until a violent altercation breaks out between Marlowe and Frizer resulting in the death of the former— they diverge markedly over how the death came about. The recorded verdict of justifiable homicide is transformed in the Narrator's relation into cold-blooded murder. The rejection of the inquest findings for the Narrator's reconstruction of the final hours of Marlowe's life involves a reappraisal of the dead man's character. What is said of Marlowe in the coroner's report reflects very negatively on him in that he is

presented as attacking Frizer from behind and drawing a dagger on him, which fortuitously —or providentially— pierces his eye in the ensuing struggle. In the Narrator's account, by contrast, Frizer is transformed from accidental homicide to willing party to a murder planned by Skeres and Poley, as he is depicted as driving the dagger into Marlowe's eye while his victim is held by the other two. Marlowe, according to the Narrator, is the object of an extra-judicial execution to silence him falsely reported as an unintentional killing made in self-defence. Since the jurors accept the murderers' false testimony, it becomes an uncontested true account of Marlowe's death, endorsing and perpetuating his unsavoury reputation of sodomite, atheist and firebrand. The murderers' plausibility serves as a perfect illustration of truth as a construct of successful discourse rather than a faithful representation of the facts (Cook 1987 [1973]: 64).

The Narrator's ulterior purpose in writing his memoir is therefore to refute the commonly-held and legally sanctioned view of Marlowe by showing him to be the victim of personal enmity, religious bigotry and political expediency. After quoting the conclusions of the inquiry into Marlowe's death, the Narrator denies their veracity:

> *Le recknynge?* What Frenchified madness is this? It is a lie, unpurposed maybe, that is a badge or brooch of the lie of the whole [p.268].

As an official document, however, the coroner's report is *ipso facto* an impartial relation of the facts following a thorough and unprejudiced examination of evidence and testimonies concerning the case under investigation by the competent authority. The reference to the brooch alludes to illusion of completion that legal discourse strives to create through the tight control it exercises over the language it uses (Cunningham 1990: 210), indicated more explicitly in the formula "[i]n witness of which thing the Coroner as well as the Jurors have interchangeably set their seals" [p.268]. A brooch is an ornament used to fasten clothing in the same way sealing wax joins leaves of paper together. Unlike a seal, which is broken on opening the document it is affixed to, a brooch can be unfastened as well as fastened, meaning the case may be re-opened so that "the lie of the whole," the false testimony given by Marlowe's murderers, may be exposed as such and refuted. By presenting an alternative version of Marlowe's death, the Narrator not only disputes the veracity of the coroner's verdict but also denies legal discourse its prerogative to both ideological and textual closure.

The Narrator's attempt to polemicise the inquest findings is seriously weakened by the conjectural nature of his account of the killing, frankly admitted by "[s]o I suppose

it happened, but I suppose only" [p.267]. The opt-out clause "I suppose" applies not only to the events of Deptford Strand but also the narrative in its entirety. Already in the opening paragraph the Narrator describes himself as one "who observed [Marlowe] intermittently" [p.3] and who will relate "what I suppose of his doings behind the back of my viewings:" that is, his relation is not based on first-hand experience, but a series of conjectures on Marlowe's movements drawn on what he knows about him from his sporadic dealings with him. The Narrator's failure to commit himself to the truth value of his account of Marlowe's life effectively renders his account of the playwright's death as no more veracious than the mendacity which vitiates the official version. The Reader is consequently faced with a choice between two conflicting relations of the same incident, neither of them definable as "truthful:" a plausible but unproven hypothesis on the one hand, and an authoritative but flawed verdict on the other.

As neither version can be credited as the truth, the rhetorical reading of the question posed in the Narrator's salutatory address is activated. Despite their discrepancies, the imaginative and judicial reconstruction of Marlowe's final instants is alike in that they both place a premium on creditability rather than ascertaining the truth of what they report. The coroner's meticulous but irrelevant attention to the facts and the Narrator's impassioned but unsubstantiated protestation of personal conviction are, in the final analysis, different discourse strategies adopted for a common end. In this context, "but where's the difference?" underlines the subordination of truthfulness to persuasiveness. As a piece of rhetoric, the Narrator's account is as much "a lie of language" as the coroner's report: hence the impossibility of distinguishing the one from the other ontologically. Alternatively, the dissolution of the veracity-falsity opposition may be attributed to a belief that the truth is not so much irrelevant as incognizable. The pyrrhonism implied by this view makes the Narrator's question an instance of aporia, the rhetorical expression of doubt (Lodge 1992: 1), imbuing the entire narrative with a tone of dubiety, not only in relation to Marlowe's life and death but also with regard to the possibility of acquiring adequate knowledge of any event.

8.3. Binarity in Relation to Politeness

As they occur in two instances of vocative address, *fair* and *foul* are to be read more as honorific and dysphemistic epithets than evaluative adjectives, recasting the opposition they express as 'polite' versus 'impolite.' Politeness is definable as any communicative strategy adopted with the aim of maintaining and promoting social harmony, which in

turn defines impoliteness as any communicative strategy which makes for social disruption (Culpeper 1995 [1994]: 349-50). Politeness theory as Brown and Levinson (1987 [1978]) formulate it holds that harmony is achieved during social interaction through the mutual upholding of face, the public identity of the self (Holtgraves 2005: 74). Accordingly, one should not impinge on other's desire for autonomy, or negative face, and endeavour to show other in a favourable light and so maintain the positive self-image the latter wishes to project, or positive face. Polite behaviour seeks to assure the recipient that the speaker is not only aware of the former's face needs and wants, but also has those needs and wants at heart (Brown and Levinson 1987 [1978]: 61-2). Showing concern for the other's face, however, is not necessarily the same as feeling concern. The effort to maintain other's face, as Brown and Levinson (1987 [1978]: 61) stress, is largely undertaken out of self-interest. By expressing concern for other's face needs, the polite speaker is more likely to enlist the former's co-operation to attain his or her goals, even when the attainment of those goals involves intruding on other's face. Indeed, the speaker engages in polite behaviour precisely because he or she is conscious of committing a face-threatening act. Since it is a means to an end, politeness is a form of imposture, which is felt to be intrinsically impolite, especially when polite behaviour is exhibited as an indirect means of gaining unfair advantage over the recipient. If one was genuinely concerned for other's face wants, the truly polite course of action to take would be to refrain from committing a face-threatening act. Politeness cultivated with an ulterior, impolite purpose is in reality impoliteness: hence the continued pertinence of "where's the difference?" on considering *fair* and *fair* as an opposition formed by an honorific and dysphemistic epithet.

8.3.1. Discreet *and* Bold*: Politeness and Sincerity*

In *A Dead Man in Deptford* the identification of politeness with hypocrisy is lexicalised in the term *discretion*. As seen in 5.1.2, discretion is the virtue Marlowe is constantly being called on to practise, although to no avail. One of the many acquaintances who urge him to be discreet is Thomas Kyd, who at the supper party Thomas Watson invites them to tell Marlowe that "you must learn of discretion" [p.24]. Kyd's word of advice is prompted by Marlowe's impromptu recital of the prologue to *The Massacre at Paris*, a digest in blank verse of Machiavellianism, the cynical view of religion as an instrument of statecraft (Hunter 1984: 141). Marlowe's flippant retort that discretion "is a great killer of God's truth or the devil's" and "a matter of good table manners" [p.25] equates

discretion with dishonesty and politeness, both written off as faint-hearted and insincere conformity with the providentialist worldview decried in his oration. As well as incautious, because of the profanity contained in the lines recited, the declamation is impolite. On the one hand it is negatively impolite in that it constitutes an invasion of the space of the other patrons of the eating house they are having supper at (Culpeper 1995 [1994]: 358). By making an exhibition of himself, Marlowe interrupts what they happen to be engaged in at that moment, momentarily obliging them to pay attention to what he is saying. On the other hand the recitation is an affront to their positive face, particularly the line "I count religion but a childish toy" [p.23]. The claim that religion is a fraud that serves the mundane interests of the ruling elite is an instance of seeking disagreement through the selection of a sensitive topic (Culpeper 1995 [1994]: 357), as it rides rough shod over the cherished beliefs of the devout Christian. Marlowe therefore comes across as indiscreet on the basis of the two definitions he gives to its affirmative antonym: he is at once unmindful of the consequences his words and deeds may have and shows a cavalier disregard for the feelings and opinions of others.

The adjective sometimes used to describe Marlowe in relation to his disdain of the uncontested assumptions that underpin the prevalent moral and political discourse is *bold*. Under boldness one can subsume a the undesirable qualities of insolence and rudeness, rendering *boldness* as the evaluative polar opposite of *discretion*, and in turn making the pair one of the numerous instances of antonymy relativised by the Narrator's question. Among the last words Francis Walsingham utters to Marlowe are "[y]ou a bold young man"[p.104], seemingly corroborating the image of his subordinate as quarrelsome and intractable. Seen in context, however, the spymaster's description turns out to be a backhanded compliment:

> You are a bold young man (here he softened) and your speaking out offers little offence. It signifies that you know your friends [p.104].

The unfavourable meaning of *bold* of 'insolent,' educed by *your speaking out*, is cancelled by its favourable meaning of 'candid,' brought out by *friends*, suggesting that the spymaster values straight talking to the extent that he is prepared to overlook his Marlowe's insubordination. In terms of Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness, Marlowe's outspokenness is a serious affront to his superior's positive face in that his expressing contrary opinions unasked undermines the latter's authority. Nevertheless, the conciliatory view Walsingham takes on Marlowe's insolence makes it clear that

saying what is on one's mind, regardless of the offence it may cause, is indicative of straight dealing, and therefore more polite than standing on ceremony and concealing one's real opinions.

Walsingham's appreciation of Marlowe's bluntness turns conventional notions of politeness on their head. Being civil but insincere is inherently impolite, especially if civility acts as a blind to the speaker's true intentions with regard to the addressee. Being uncivil but sincere, by contrast, need not be dismissed as impoliteness, particularly if the speaker has no hostile designs on the addressee. However, since the speaker's intentions towards the recipient are not always clear, it is not possible to know whether the former's civility or incivility are instances of politeness or covert impoliteness: hence the force of the Narrator's question "but where's the difference?"

8.3.2. Friendly *and* Not Friendly*: Politeness and Friendliness*

For Walsingham Marlowe's frankness, though irksome, is 'friendly.' Friendliness is a sign of the latter's confidence, and therefore of his loyalty and trustworthiness, and where there is mutual trust and understanding there is little or no need for ceremony. The adjective *friendly* is a term belonging to one of the many instances of antonymy which recur in the narrative, making it antonym pair an exponent of the dichotomy between politeness and impoliteness in *A Dead Man in Deptford*. Friendliness, if not strictly equivalent to politeness, appears to be an important aspect of politeness.

According to Aristotle (2000: 147), whose tripartite classification of friendship was reviewed in relation to sexual desire in male bonding in 7.2, true friendship is a relationship governed by mutual goodwill on the part of those engaged in it. Goodwill may be identified with genuine concern for the other's face needs, either positively desiring and working for the other's good, or negatively by not desiring any harm to the other. Positive goodwill would correspond to the unceremonious politeness that exists among friends, whereas negative goodwill would be equivalent to the absence of malice underlying the neutral *pro forma* politeness among strangers. Brown and Gilman's application of the Brown and Levinson model to four Shakespearean tragedies (1989) centres on polite but dishonest speakers with evil designs on their addressees. Politeness, these authors (1989: 207) conclude, "is deliberate behaviour that can be put on in the interests of greed, advancement, and desire," a putting into practice a "cynical education in *savoir-faire*" (Wildeblood and Brinson 1965: 38). The dishonest *pro forma* politeness reported, it may be added, is in terms of the threat they represent to the

recipient's face extremely impolite, although it is taken at face value until the speaker's intentions are exposed.

Brown and Gilman's working out of the implications of Brown and Levinson's utilitarian view of politeness is consistent with the Narrator's interrogation of conventional politeness in his salutation to the Reader. Walsingham may be sincere when he identifies Marlowe as a friend, but the same cannot be said of the latter's colleagues in the Service. A good illustration of the false overtures Marlowe receives from them is Robert Poley's pained appeal to their friendship in

> —You have been privy to much that is most secret and you are not to be let loose to blather among playmen and others. Oh, Kit, Kit, are we not friends? And with the change of tone the cat began purring.
> —Of a kind, yes. But not of the playman kind.
> —Let that pass, there are friends and friends [p.203].

The rhetorical question rounding off Poley's first intervention is an example of the positive politeness strategy of claiming common ground to redress the speaker's encroachment on the addressee's negative face, and in so doing get him to carry out the action demanded of him by the face-threatening act of forbidding him to speak (Brown and Levinson 1987 [1978]: 107-8). Poley's choice of address form mitigates the peremptory tone of the prohibition at the same it increases the moral obligations invoked by the in-group identity marker *friends*. By calling Marlowe by his familiar name, another in-group identity marker, Poley constrains his subordinate to answer in the affirmative, giving to understand not only that a positive answer is expected but also that a negative answer would place the onus squarely on Marlowe for the estrangement arising from it. The denial of friendship would in turn leave Poley free of the obligations he owes Marlowe as his friend, which in view of the information the latter is privy to would carry very serious consequences. Seen in its entirety, then, Poley's utterance is a warning to keep faith with the Service, the shift from negative impoliteness to positive politeness emphasising rather than downplaying the menacing undertones to his words.

Marlowe's answer is both a confirmation and disavowal of the friendship Poley ostensibly lays claim to. The hedging phrase *Of a kind* has a down-toning effect on its elided head, giving to understand that *friends* is not the most accurate term for their relationship but it will do insofar as their association is grounded on a mutual exchange of favours. Friends "of the playman kind," Marlowe seems to imply, have a common outlook on life, derive pleasure from one another's company, and are bound by close

ties of affection, in contrast to the self-interest that characterises his relationship with Poley. In the light of the differing conceptions of friendship he points to, Marlowe's answer is at once friendly and unfriendly. It is friendly in that it is an assurance that he will not betray the trust Poley has placed in him, and it is unfriendly in that it is a rebuff to Poley's profession of amity. This blend of friendly assurance and unfriendly repulse serves as a reminder of the thin line dividing politeness from impoliteness.

Poley's assent to his subordinate's perception of their friendship as one based on mutual interest rather than liking defines *friendly* as a shared commitment to the cause they both serve. The meaning of 'one of our own' seems to underlie the use of the adjective made by Richard Baines, the agent entrusted with the task of keeping tabs on Marlowe, on reproaching him for being "not friendly" whenever they meet. Baines's grievance against him is ostensibly occasioned by Marlowe's failure to repay a favour he once did him, the granting and returning of favours being the mainstay of friendship. The criticism of his unfriendliness is in reality a warning that Marlowe is not toeing the line, and that his refusal to submit to the discipline of the Service will eventually cause his employers to suspect him of abandoning his allegiance. "That is not friendly" [p.246] are Baines's last words to Marlowe, uttered just before he hands in to the Privy Council a list of seditious and blasphemous remarks attributed to the man he has been tailing. In this context *not friendly* means that Marlowe is regarded as a rogue agent and to be treated accordingly, fulfilling the veiled threat contained in Poley's call to order.

The duplicity shown by Poley and Baines in their claims on Marlowe's friendship reveals the relevance Walsingham's observation "you know your friends" has for Marlowe's troubled relations with his colleagues in the Service. The ambiguous answer he gives to Poley indicates that he does know those who mean him well, and that he does not count his associates in the Service among those who do. He realises that the affability shown by his so-called friends is merely a ploy they resort to as long as they believe that he fits into their schemes, and that the more fulsome their professions of friendship are, the more onerous the impositions they place on him and the more intensely they plot against him. Friendliness, like politeness, is deliberate behaviour which can be assumed to deceive and mislead. The confusion arising from the exaggeration of positive politeness to disguise serious trespasses on both the recipient's positive and negative face extends in the scope of "where's the difference?" from politeness to friendliness, the feelings of amity and sympathy which supposedly underpins polite behaviour. The conflation of politeness into friendliness bears directly

on Burgess's fictional recreation of Christopher Marlowe's life in that it may be read as an exercise in distinguishing his friends from his enemies, a task complicated by the efforts of the latter to conceal their increasing aversion to Marlowe behind a mask of conviviality.

8.4. Politeness and Naming

Given the onomastic status of *reader* in the Narrator's greeting and leave-taking, the interrogation of the principle of binarity is extended to naming and its relevance to the polite/impolite dichotomy, whether it concerns pro forma or solidary politeness, identified respectively under the labels *discretion* and *friendly*. Robert Poley's addressing Marlowe as *Kit* in 8.3.2, for instance, upholds the latter's positive face in that familiar-name address identifies him as a fellow member of the social group to which the speaker belongs, suggesting that they share common goals and values. If Poley had opted for *Marlowe*, his entreaty would have lost much of its force because the solidarity conveyed by *Kit* is absent from the family name. Marlowe's rejoinder, however, gives to understand that Poley's naming style is felt as an intrusion on his negative face, and therefore more an instance of negative impoliteness than positive politeness. If, on this interpretation, Poley wanted to be polite, then he should have called him by his family name, because it is more respectful of Marlowe's wish to conduct their relationship on a strictly professional basis. Being polite consists in striking the right balance between the recipient's positive and negative face needs (Scollon and Scollon 1995: 38), which is achieved by choosing the appropriate form of address for the occasion (Leech 1983: 12), between one indicating deferential distance for addressees who belong to a different social group or one expressing attentive involvement for addressees who form part of the same social group as the speaker.

Marlowe's touchiness on being addressed as *Kit* suggests that personal names, whether used vocatively or referentially, identify their bearers in two ways. First, as seen in 2.2.2, names are used for the primary identification of their bearers, a function they share with personal pronouns. Accordingly, names, particularly core names, may be regarded alongside personal pronouns as person deictics, forms which identify the participants of a speech event. Second, names place their users at a symbolic distance from their bearers according to the former's estimate of their status with regard to the latter, of the degree of intimacy between them and the type of interaction they are engaged in (Zwicky 1974: 795-6). Besides person deixis, which, together with place and

time deixis, identifies the three basic parameters of the situational context in which utterances are made (Levinson 1983: 54; Wales 1989: 112; Crystal 1991 [1980]: 96; Bussmann 1996: 117), names are used for social deixis, or encoding of the social identities of the participants of the speech event (Levinson 1979: 206). Brown and Levinson (1987 [1978]: 76-8) identify two variables in the speaker's estimation of his or her status relative to the addressee, namely social distance and power. Because choice of name is conditioned by these two variables, the interrelation of social distance and power will be the point of departure for the following overview of politeness in naming.

8.4.1. Distance and Power

Social distance can be defined as the perceived feelings of the degree of separation or closeness between speaker and addressee (Abercrombie et al. 2000 [1984]: 322), based on the assessment of stable social attributes (Brown and Levinson 1987 [1978]: 77). Roughly, the distance which separates them will be perceived as great if speaker and addressee come from different social groups, and small if they belong to the same social group. The reflex of social closeness is the mutual maintenance of positive face, and by implication that of social distance the reciprocal avoidance of trespassing on negative face, or, if this proves unavoidable, the taking of redressive action to compensate for the intrusion on negative face. However, as Holtgraves (2005: 82) points out, closeness tends to be identified with liking, which can exist between interactants belonging to different social groups, or conversely be absent from a relationship between interactants belonging to the same social group. Solidarity and affect, the terms Holtgraves (2005: 82) uses to refer to social distance and liking respectively, may therefore be regarded as dimensions which can subsumed under distance. The double-reading of *friend* in Marlowe's put-down of Poley's entreaty (see 8.3.2) throws into relief the ambiguity of this variable by guaranteeing solidarity while withholding affect.

Social distance interacts with, and is modified by, the second variable, power. Following Wrong (1979) and Kramarae et al. (1984), Calvo (1991 [1990]: 1) defines power as the capacity to influence the behaviour of others, a capacity that can be exerted intentionally or unintentionally. Brown and Levinson (1987 [1978]: 77) reformulate this definition as the degree to which the powerful member of the social dyad can impose his or her own plans at the expense of the plans and self-evaluation of the powerless member. When it has legal, social and traditional sanction, power is invested with authority, thereby legitimising the exercise of power (Abercrombie et al. 2000 [1984]:

21). The various forms that the exercise of power takes, whether authorised or not, has two sources: physical, through the control of material resources or recourse to physical or psychic force, and metaphysical, through the control of the actions of others by means of specialised knowledge, persuasion or manipulation (Brown and Levinson 1987 [1978]: 77). Most manifestations of power occur in a linguistic medium by means of speech acts which get others to do something for the speaker, each type of speech act associated with a different type of power. Thus, Calvo (1991 [1990]: 1), quoting Kramarae et al. (1984: 11), identifies directives with authority, or the contractual acceptance of another to exercise power; argumentation with persuasion, or verbal agility; flattery and cajolement with manipulation, or concealed power; and threats with psychic force.

An asymmetrical power relation is conducive to greater social distance within the social dyad. Neither the imposition on negative face nor the failure to attend to positive face is deemed to be impolite if they are performed by an authorised social superior to an inferior, but constitute a serious affront if they are performed by an inferior to a superior. Asymmetrical relations are traditionally expressed in converses such as *older than*, *nobler than* and *richer than*, or *husband of*, *parent of*, *subject of* and *employer of* (Brown and Gilman 1960: 255). However, although the superiors of the converse relations just enumerated are said to have absolute power over their inferiors by virtue of the authority they have over them, the latter can enjoy relative power over the former by means of persuasion and manipulation (Calvo 1991 [1990]: 1-2).

As regards naming, the imposition of a name is an exercise of the namer's power over the named (Nuessel 1992: 3). Returning to the names used for exemplification used in 2.2, the instance of nicknaming in

> Sir Francis Walsingham (...) was a frail dark man that the Queen, that liked him little called the Moor [p.26]

provides a good illustration in this regard. As reigning sovereign, Queen Elizabeth has absolute freedom to indulge in her whimsical pastime of inventing sobriquets for her courtiers regardless of the embarrassment it may cause them because, if they retaliated in kind, they would almost certainly suffer reprisals. The example also illustrates to what extent names encode the social identities of their bearers.

8.4.2. The Encoding of Distance and Power

Following, and slightly amending, Levinson (1979: 207), honorifics are linguistic expressions that encode social distance between the participants of a speech event. In most European languages, as in English until the end of the early Modern period, social distance and closeness are encoded in a dual system of pronouns of address, one set of pronouns conveying social distance, and the other social closeness. Social distance and closeness, as suggested in the introduction to this section, is encoded in the naming system as well: the familiar name *Kit* communicates affect and solidarity, in contrast to the family name *Marlowe*, which communicates distance. Pronouns and names which encode distance and closeness will henceforward be considered as honorific and non-honorific forms respectively. In their highly influential monograph on the social dimension of pronoun usage, Brown and Gilman (1960: 259) argue that social dyads exhibit one of three patterns in the use of pronouns of address, a variation attributed to the operation of two semantic dimensions, power and solidarity. These patterns, they further argue (1960: 267), are also found in naming, suggesting a correlation between the pronominal and onomastic encoding of distance. Because the naming system, on account of its tripartite division into core, mixed and non-core names, is more complex than the pronoun system, the pronominal encoding of social distance will be examined first, using the defunct opposition of honorific *you* with non-honorific *thou*, followed by an examination of the onomastic encoding of this variable.

8.4.2.1. *The Pronominal Encoding of Distance*

The starting point of Brown and Gilman's study is the growing use of the plural pronoun of address for a single addressee discernible in most European languages during the Middle Ages (1960: 255). It is also observed that individuals addressed in this way were invariably figures of authority, as opposed to lesser individuals, who continued to be addressed by the singular pronoun. As a result, three distinctive patterns of pronoun address evolved determined by the power relation between the two members of the social dyad, namely reciprocal *thou*, reciprocal *you* and non-reciprocal *you-thou*. Reciprocality of *thou* is found in dyads formed by solidary social equals, solidarity being a relationship based on the affinities of those who maintain it (Brown and Gilman 1960: 258). Reciprocality of *you*, by contrast, characterises dyads formed by non-solidary social equals, although increased frequency of interactive closeness may induce them eventually to adopt reciprocal *thou* (Brown and Gilman 1989: 178). Non-

reciprocal *you* and *thou* is typical of dyads formed by individuals of different status, with the powerful member using *thou* and receiving *you* in return (Brown and Gilman 1960: 255-7). In the latter case the relative permanence of asymmetrical power relations does not impede the shift from the non-reciprocal exchange of *thou* for *you* to a reciprocal exchange of *thou*, although when this occurs, the switch in pronominal address is invariably initiated by express invitation from the dominant member of the dyad, or dispensation (Fasold 1990: 12). As it does not alter the power relation between the interactants, such condescension is a subtle exercise of power rather than an attempt to place the relationship on a more egalitarian footing. The prerogative to demand *thou* from a social inferior is as much a sign of power as the expectation to receive *you*.

Brown and Gilman draw attention to two peculiarities that has set the English system of address pronouns apart from that of other European languages. The first difference is the evolution of the medieval dual system to the single system we are familiar with today in which *you* performs all the functions of second-person address. The simplification of the system of pronominal address is put down to the transition from the traditional status hierarchy defined by titular rank to a more fluid competitive status society based on the acquisition of wealth which took place in early Modern England, the period in which *A Dead Man in Deptford* is set, and which encouraged a more egalitarian ideology (Brown and Gilman 1960: 264). The second difference concerns the temporary shift from *you* to *thou* frequently reported of early Modern English usage of address pronouns (Brown and Gilman 1960: 274-5; 1989: 178; Quirk 1971: 70-2; Wales 1983: 114-6; Alexander 1990: 231; Barber 1997 [1976]: 154). These fluctuations are said to be expressive of the strong feelings the addressee arouses in the speaker, either of immense pity or especially warm affection, of withering scorn or passionate hatred. Wales (1983: 115-6) and Leith (1984: 54-9) suggest that these two idiosyncrasies are linked. Drawing on Quirk (1971: 70-1), who proposes that *you* and *thou* constitute a structural opposition, Wales attributes the ascendancy of unmarked *you* to its association with polite, cultured, and above all public speech, bringing about the relegation of marked *thou* to informal, intimate speech and its acquiring connotations of intense emotion that should only be vented in private. According to Leith (1984: 57), it is its unmarkedness that recommended *you* to an emergent citizen class increasingly conscious of its economic power and desirous of the social prestige of the nobility yet still unsure of its status. As a result, marked *thou* picked up social connotations, used to assert position when used by a social superior to an inferior, or to

show disrespect when used by one social equal to another, or an social inferior to a superior. The evolution of *you* can therefore be summarised as a transformation of a non-honorific pronoun of plural address into an honorific pronoun of singular address, followed in turn by a further transformation into an all-purpose address pronoun that is neither honorific nor non-honorific.

8.4.2.2. *The Onomastic Encoding of Distance*

As social distance and power are also encoded in personal names, the three patterns described in 8.4.2.1 apply to naming as well. However, thanks to the existence of socially uncommitted *you*, no-naming becomes a viable option in situations in which there is uncertainty as to the status of the addressee (Leith 1984: 57; Ervin-Tripp 1986 [1972]: 221), adding a fourth pattern to the other three. Another point to be borne in mind is that personal names are used referentially as well as vocatively, which means that they may give information about the relationship between the user and the named, the bearer of a name used referentially (Allan and Burridge 1991: 39). Following Comrie (1976) and Levinson (1979: 207), names may be used as referent as well as addressee honorifics. Also, the setting in which the speech event takes place should be taken into account as well, in that a high degree of formality tightly constrains choice of name while high degree of informality allows greater freedom of choice. Naming, in other words, is conditioned as much by the situational context of speech event as the social distance and relative power which exists between the user and bearer.

8.4.2.2.1. Naming Styles

Whereas the pronominal encoding of social distance offers a choice between an honorific and non-honorific alternate for the purposes of address, the morphological diversity and dual function of names provides a broader variety of styles for both referential and vocative use, style being understood as situational constraints on choice of language. Allan and Burridge (1991: 40) quote Joos (1967: 11) in identifying five naming styles, which are

frozen > formal > consultative > casual > intimate.

The designations just given, these authors stress, serve merely as reference points on a cline of decreasing formality to exhaust all possible manners of addressing and naming, and no claim is made that it is possible to establish firm boundaries between adjacent styles. Roughly, and assuming that the user and bearer are social equals, the social

distance encoded in the name decreases as one moves from one end of the continuum to the other, accompanied by a parallel diminution of negative politeness and increase of positive politeness. Honorific names are spread out along the first two styles in decreasing order of formality, and non-honorific names along the last two in increasing order of informality. The consultative style constitutes something as a hybrid in that it is used when one of the members of the social dyad is socially superior but of friendly disposition to the other, or when they are socially distant equals (Allan and Burridge 1991: 43).

On filling in each slot with an example of name, one becomes aware of a correlation between naming style and the morphology of personal names. Thus, and again resorting to the various names Francis Walsingham is called by, in

the Secretary of State > Mr Walsingham > Francis Walsingham > Francis > Frank

one observes that the more formal the style is, the more peripheral the name. The full name *Francis Walsingham*, the prototypical personal name, occupies the halfway point on the formality scale, and therefore may be regarded as neutral as far as social distance is concerned. This identifies the full name as the onomastic equivalent of non-committed *you*, although, with the exception of didactic naming and the language of administrative record, the full name is rarely used for the primary identification of its bearer. Again, mention should be made of the impossibility of establishing fixed boundaries between adjacent styles, especially between causal and intimate style. *Francis* and its end-clipped form *Frank* are interchangeable: both the forename and familiar name belong as much to the intimate as causal style. The consultative style, moreover, has a masking effect on the way names are used. For instance, *Frank* is appropriate for a casual and intimate style of address; but when a social inferior has been given dispensation to use it, the familiar name is in pragmatic terms consultative. This is because the reciprocity of casual address is not accompanied by a change in the asymmetrical power relation between the members of the social dyad.

What also merits comment is that the degree of formality can also be ranked on a personalising scale (Allan and Burridge 1991: 42). The forename, as Room (1989: 1) points out, identifies the bearer's private self while the family name is associated with his or her public persona: hence the identification of *Francis* with a causal and intimate style, and *Walsingham* with a consultative and formal style. The frozen style makes use of the least personalised name. In calling Francis Walsingham *the Secretary of State*, the

speaker is not referring so much to the person as the office he holds. Impersonalisation by name avoidance is identified as a negative politeness strategy (Brown and Levinson 1987 [1978]: 204): by calling Walsingham by his titular name, the speaker signals that he is being consulted solely in his official capacity as secretary of state, and consequently the responsibility that may fall out for failing to attend to the speaker's requirements can be placed on the office itself instead of the holder.

Finally, it should be noted that externally derived nicknames constitute an exception to the principles just outlined in relation to naming styles. Like *the Secretary of State* nicknames are non-core names, yet they belong to a causal or intimate style rather than a formal or frozen one. Also, as they characterise the recipient physically or morally, nicknames are perceived to be a personalised mode of naming, over against the impersonality of non-core titular names. Because they are often thought up to stigmatise the recipient (Morgan et al. 1979: 47), nicknames frequently affront rather than attend to positive face, as is the case of *the Moor*. Although reasonably consistent, the correlation between naming style on the hand, and peripherality and politeness on the other, is a not perfect one.

8.4.2.2.2. Distance in Speaker-Addressee Relations

By and large the onomastic encoding of distance in speaker-addressee relations parallels the pronominal encoding of this variable. The three patterns of pronoun address described in 8.4.2.1 can also be discerned in onomastic address, as evidenced by the following four pairs of utterances:

16. —[W]hat was his name, Frizer? [p.48]
    —Here is grave news, master [p.200]
17. —Chumley or Cholmondeley, there be many spellings and soundings [p.197]
    —Watson. Kit, I must go to my wife
18. —Dear Kit. After so long. [p.180]
    —You must speak for yourself, Tom [p.181].

The participants in each pair are the same, although their roles are switched as one passes from one utterance to another so that the speaker in the first becomes the addressee in the second, and vice versa. It also be mentioned that none of the extracts constitutes an adjacency pair, although [17] and [18] occur in the same conversational exchange; but this does not affect the social distance encoded in the names used. Excerpt [18] exemplifies an instance of non-reciprocal address reflecting an asymmetrical power relation between the speakers. The first speaker addresses the

second by his family name and is addressed in turn by the status noun *master*, identifying their relationship as that of employer-employee. Excerpt [17] contains, as Brown and Gilman would term it, an example of reciprocal non-solidary address. Both *Chumley* and *Watson* are instances of didactic naming between strangers that have just met and are unsure of one another's status. In this situation the family name is analogous to non-committed *you*, a form of address that enables the speakers to avoid an unintentional affront to face. Excerpt [18] contains an instance of reciprocal solidary address, the giving of *Kit* in return for *Tom* indicating that the speakers are on first-name terms.

However, since naming operates on a five-point scale, personal names provide much finer gradations of social and emotional distance than pronouns of address do. As regards non-reciprocal address, this becomes apparent on contrasting [16] with these two other excerpts

19. —No, Sir Walter [p.137]
    —Merlin, throw open the door to let the fumes out [p.140]
20. —Tell us, the Earl said somewhat mildly, of this rivalry and hate [p.245]
    —You will know more of it than I, my lord.

Master and *Frizer* belong to the frozen and consultative style respectively, whereas *Sir Walter* and *Merlin*, one of variants of *Marlowe*, are respectively slotted in the formal and consultative style. The degree of social distance is consequently greater in the first social dyad than in the second. Excerpt [20] is interesting in that frozen *my lord*, the address form for male aristocrats (Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg 1995: 574), is given in return for no-naming. Of the three exchanges of address forms under review, then, the last reflects the greatest social distance, as the second speaker does not even register on the scale. This suggests that no-naming can be used as much to affront positive face as avoid imposing on negative face. In line with the Latin tag *sine nomine persona non est*, the first speaker's avoidance of the addressee's name not only highlights the social gulf separating commoner from nobleman but also annuls his interlocutor by symbolically transforming him into a non-person (Anderson 2003: 356).

Social distance can be decreased or increased within each style as well by means of endearments and status markers. In [18], for instance, the prefixing of *Dear* to *Kit* enhances the intimacy conveyed by the familiar name so that, regardless of whether or not the speaker's feelings match the effusiveness of his address, the resulting vocative communicates more emotional closeness than bare *Kit*. Conversely, the status marker in

Sir Walter increases social distance within the remit of causal or intimate style in which forenames are ordinarily placed. While the core onomastic component of the mixed titular name signals the existence of a friendly rapport between user and addressee, the status marker serves as a reminder of the difference in social rank which separates them, as well as the asymmetry of the power relation between them. In terms of Holtgraves's reformulation of distance (see 8.4.1), the consultative style of *Sir Walter* is indicative of a non-solidary relationship in which there is liking between those engaged in it. The possibility of increasing or decreasing social distance within each style is one of the factors that work against the setting up of well-defined boundaries between adjoining styles.

In the review of the pronominal encoding of social distance in 8.4.2.1. mention was made of the dispensation given by a social superior to an inferior to forego honorific *you* for non-honorific *thou*. Similar dispensations can be given with names, as in the following exchange

> 21. my dear Kit, it has been so long, I have had a hard time, I know the hell of imprisonment, and I have had the rigours of much travel in the cause, thank God we are together again, call me Robin.
>
> —Robin, Kit said doubtfully, well sir, so I call you Robin [p.176].

Robert Poley, the first speaker, grants Marlowe the permission to call him by his familiar name, even though they occupy different positions in the hierarchy of the Servive. As Marlowe's superior Poley's invitation is in fact an assertion of his power over his subordinate in that the initiation of reciprocal exchange of non-honorific forms of address between non-equals is the prerogative of the powerful member of the dyad. With regard to naming, power is shown by the speaker's capacity to call the addressee by whatever name he chooses, realised here by Poley's calling Marlowe *Dear Kit*, and to have others call him by the name he chooses to be called by, realised by Marlowe's hesitant acquiescence. Being on first-name terms with his boss is not the same as being on equal footing with him.

8.4.2.2.3. Distance in Speaker-Named Relations

As names either have both a referential and vocative function or develop specialised forms for reference and vocative address, it would follow that the encoding of distance for speaker-named relations is identical to that of speaker-addressee ones. The referential and vocative uses of *Kit* in "[h]e gets at Kit another way" [p.225] and "[y]ou are gloomy, Kit" [p.253] seem to confirm this: the casual style expresses the speaker's

familiarity or intimacy with the absent bearer in the first utterance, and his solidarity with the addressee in the second. If the name is substituted by, say, co-referential consultative *Marlowe*, the increase of social distance will be the same for the speaker and named as for the speaker and addressee. The complementary principles of reciprocality and non-reciprocality are applicable to the speaker-referent relation as well, at least in theory. If the speaker of the first utterance, identified as Thomas Nashe, is referred to as *Tom* by the bearer of *Kit*, their relationship will be a solidary or intimate one. If, on the other hand, he is referred to by a more distant name such as *Mr Nashe*, then he will be acknowledged as the social superior of the named. From the double function performed by *Kit* one may draw the inference that the relationships reflected by naming practices hold between speaker and referent as well as speaker and addressee.

The naming of a third party is complicated by the speaker's relationship to his or interlocutor on the one hand, and the between the interlocutor and named on the other. Nashe's use of the familiar name to refer to Marlowe in the first utterance above strongly suggests that his interlocutor, identified as William Shakespeare, is on friendly terms with both named and namer. If Shakespeare and Marlowe were strangers, Nashe would have chosen a name belonging to a consultative or formal style, such as *Kit Marlowe* or *Mr Marlowe*. To call him *Kit* in such a scenario would be felt as an imposition on the negative face of both Shakespeare and Marlowe because it implies an inexistent closeness. If, on the other hand, Shakespeare and Marlowe were intimates but Nashe a stranger to both, the latter would still use a consultative or formal name. To have chosen *Kit* would also be an intrusion on the named and addressee's negative face in that the speaker arrogates a social closeness he is not entitled to. A third scenario is that Nashe and Shakespeare are strangers, but Marlowe is a mutual friend of theirs. In this case the use of *Kit* would be interpretable as an offer to establish friendly relations between speaker and addressee on the strength of their common relationship with Marlowe, a move explicable in terms of the positive politeness strategy of claim common ground (Brown and Levinson 1987: 107-10). If consultative *Kit Marlowe* or formal *Mr Marlowe* were used, it would signal that the speaker is not interested in the addressee's friendship.

8.4.2.2.4. The Influence of Setting on Naming

If speaker-addressee relations are considered as part of the situational context in which the speech event takes place, then the account of third-party naming just given serves as

an illustration of how the setting can condition choice of name. In fact, the definition of style given in 8.4.2.2.1 takes for granted the idea that there are situational constraints on name choice. However, the degree to which choice of name is constrained varies from situation to situation. The greater the degree of formality demanded by the setting, the more formal the style of naming will be, and the tighter the constraints on choice. As one moves down the five-point formality scale, then, there is an increase in the freedom in choice of name, especially in the casual and intimate styles, corroborated by the greater forename alternates which Brown and Ford (1961) report of intimate friendships (quoted in Ervin-Tripp 1986 [1972]: 225).

Moving to the other end of the scale, the frozen and formal style are associated with what Ervin-Tripp (1986 [1972]: 220) terms status marked situations. These are defined as settings in which the status of each person is clearly specified, and speech style rigidly prescribed so that the only forms of address admitted are those which convey the social identity of the participants. The prescriptions on naming also apply to intimates present at such situations, who are temporarily obliged to abandon their habitual style of address for one more in keeping with the formal requirements of the setting. A good instance of how intimate address forms are masked by status marked settings is provided by the extracts below

22. He came for me as I left the house, bravo-ing and with his sword drawn. Then Mr Watson [p.168]
23. His forehead dripped, he begged pardon, his handkerchief was in the sleeve of the jerkin still in Mr Marlowe's house.

Marlowe and Thomas Watson, the speakers of [22] and [23] respectively, are close friends who normally address and, among other intimates, refer to one another by familiar *Tom* and *Kit*. The use of honorific *Mr Watson* and *Mr Marlowe* is dictated by the fact that the interlocutor in each case is a figure of authority acting in their official capacity, the constable that arrests them for homicide in the first case, and the magistrate they are brought to in the second. In both cases, moreover, the consultative name is used with the named present as a bystander. In each case the relation with the authorised interlocutor prevails over friendship, and above this there is the gravity of the situation they find themselves in: under arrest on suspicion of a murder under official investigation.

8.5. Impolite Naming

The failure to keep the right distance *vis-à-vis* other results in impoliteness. Either the speaker comes too close and intrudes on the addressee's negative face, or holds aloof and injures the addressee's positive face. As regards naming, Culpeper (1995 [1994]: 357-8) identifies two impoliteness strategies: deliberately adopting an inappropriate style, and using imprecatives or negatively evaluative terms. In the first case the speaker is either over-familiar, using a casual or intimate form of address when a consultative or formal style is required, or over-polite, using a consultative or formal address form when a casual or intimate style is expected. Such impoliteness can be unintentional, the result of the failure to gauge social distance correctly rather than the desire to cause offence, and therefore more easily pardoned. To these two strategies one may add the ironic adherence to appropriate naming style, a ploy Culpeper (1995 [1994]: 357) subsumes under mock politeness. Impolite naming, then, falls roughly into three types according to the directness of the affront to the target's face: openly by name-calling, more or less openly by deliberately using an inappropriate naming style, and covertly by insincerely using an appropriate naming style.

8.5.1. *The Ironic Adherence to Appropriate Naming Style*

The contradiction incurred in being impolite by being polite can be explained as a speech act in which the politeness conveyed through the locution is undercut by the impoliteness perceived in the illocution. That is to say, the demeanour of the outwardly polite speaker betrays his or her dislike or disrespect for the target. The degree to which the speaker discloses his or her attitude towards the target varies. At one extreme the speaker can be polite with bad grace, a form of sarcasm consisting in the perfunctory observance of the rules of verbal politeness that draws attention to the impolite opinion concealed in the locution. At the other extreme the speaker masks his or her feelings so completely that the target takes the polite locution at its face value, the impolite illocution being left to be picked up by the bystanders present at the exchange. If the ironic intent is perceived by the target, the insincere observance of naming style is especially aggravating because it effectively forestalls any accusation of disrespect.

A highly effective form of indirect impoliteness is the punctilious observance of correct behaviour (Goffman 1956: 480). Marlowe's appearance before the commission of inquiry set up by the Privy Council [pp.241-7] furnishes ample evidence of impolite

punctiliousness and in the manner of illustration the following two exchanges between the dramatist and the Earl of Essex, one of his inquisitors, will be examined:

24. —A company that met at Durham House under the shield of the man Raleigh?
—Sir Walter, if I am to be absolute in matters of title and address [p.243]
25. Questioned on your association with one that teacheth atheism. I mean the man Raleigh.
—Sir Walter, yes, my lord. He has never taught atheism [p.244].

What merits interest about these two excerpts is the double edge to Marlowe's insistence on the strict adherence to etiquette. While it upholds Raleigh's positive face, his scrupulousness seriously damages Essex's. In pointing out that a knight ought not to be styled *that man* but *Sir*, Marlowe is correcting his interrogator, a serious threat to Essex's positive face in that it presupposes that he is mistaken, unreasonable or wrong about the issue in question, and therefore contains an element of negative criticism of his or her beliefs, attitudes or behaviour (Brown and Levinson 1987 [1978]: 66). Marlowe's reminder represents the Earl as grossly ignorant of the rules of polite behaviour, deliberately unmindful of them or lacking in the self-control needed to keep his antipathy to Raleigh within bounds. None of these implicatures reflect favourably on Essex as they suggest a boorish, peremptory and unthinking personality.

The repetition of the correction in [25] confirms the suspicion that Marlowe is being impertinent. The vocative *my lord*, the form of address Essex is entitled to, aggravates rather than mitigates his impertinence because, coming immediately after the correction of *the man Raleigh*, the title highlights the contrast between the speaker's concern for giving everyone their due and the addressee's contempt for social niceties. Marlowe's impertinence is further aggravated by the disparity in the status of the interlocutors and the formality of the setting in which their exchange takes place. The impoliteness inherent in correction is greatly augmented by the fact that Essex has a far higher rank than Marlowe, and that he is the holder of public office acting in his official capacity. As his interrogator's social inferior Marlowe has no business to point out the Earl's lack of social graces, even if the implied criticism is justified, and as a witness under examination his reminders are irrelevant to the proceedings. To add further insult to injury, Essex is corrected in the presence of his compeers, leaving no doubt as to Marlowe's impolite intentions even though no rule of polite behaviour has been overtly flouted. By keeping to the letter but not the spirit of courtesy, Marlowe succeeds in being much more impolite than Essex, corroborating Brown and Gilman's conclusion on the deceptiveness of pro forma politeness (see 8.3.2.).

8.5.2. *Inappropriate Naming Style*

Intentional impoliteness through inappropriate naming style involves either deliberate over-familiarity or deliberate over-politeness. Over-familiarity not only intrudes on the target's negative face, but also undermines his or her positive face under the pretence of attending to it. The inappropriate use of casual or intimate address forms serve to belittle the target, especially when pet names or diminutive nicknames are involved. Over-politeness similarly damages the target's positive face while ostensibly boosting it. Allan and Burridge (1991: 41) refer to the bureaucratic practice of dignifying menial occupations by euphemistically exaggerating their importance through long, high-sounding titles. Hyperbole, as Leech (1983: 147) points out, is a highly ambivalent pragmatic strategy to adopt because it tends to be perceived as insincere. Over-polite naming involves rhetorical overstatement; with the result that over-politeness will be felt to be ironic, and therefore insincere, insomuch as it adverts to the glaring disparity between the exalted tone of the name and the pedestrian character of the named. The fulsome attribution of virtues the target is deemed to lack and the effusive protestation of esteem the speaker does not have are alike in that they both resort to exaggeration to undermine the target's self-evaluation and wants.

Marlowe's interrogation by the Privy Council provides a good example of deliberate over-politeness, namely the following fragment from Thomas Heneage's intervention to prevent Marlowe and Essex's mutual animosity from flaring up into an open quarrel:

> If my lord of Essex would fire guns against Sir Walter, there are occasions and *loci* where we others would not wish to be implicated. With all due and most humilous deference, good my dear lord [p.244].

Heneage's mediation is in reality a call to order, directed more to his fellow Privy Councillor than Marlowe. Like the latter's repeated corrections examined in 8.5.1, this constitutes a serious face-threatening act in that the reminder of the irrelevance of the Earl's enmity with Raleigh is a reprimand for a lack of self-restraint, and as such an expression of disapproval (Brown and Levinson 1987 [1978]: 66). To minimise the threat to the Earl's positive face, Heneage resorts to referential *my lord of Essex*, treating the addressee as a third person being a redressive strategy identified by Brown and Levinson (1987 [1978]: 190). Further redress is given by the exaggerated assurances of respect and esteem offered immediately after Heneage's request, and characterised by the contrast of *due* and *most humilous* with *good* and *dear* to set off the

speaker's submissiveness against the addressee's distinction. The marked contrast between the humbling of the speaker and exaltation of the addressee upholds the latter's face while directly threatening the former's (Brown and Levinson 1987 [1978]: 68), which raises doubts as to Heneage's sincerity. If he were really so mindful of the Earl's susceptibilities, he would have resorted to more indirect means of carrying out the face-threatening act or refrained from carrying it out altogether. Polite overstatement quickly becomes debased through a process of diminishing returns so that it is re-interpreted as flattery or irony (Leech 1983: 147), and therefore insincere. Finally, and more importantly, hyperbolic expressions of politeness are out of place during the transaction of official business such as the interrogation of a suspected religious dissident. It is extremely unlikely that a high-ranking official would lower himself in such circumstances, above all in the presence of a suspect. Taking everything into consideration, then, Heneage's recourse to hyperbole is more likely to be a case of ironic rather than polite overstatement so that his behaviour is describable as mock-politeness rather than politeness.

8.5.3. *Insult and Labelling*

Alongside names used in an ironical or deliberately inappropriate manner, there are those expressly used to threaten the recipient's positive face and destroy social harmony. Zwicky (1974: 792) refers to terms used for blatant affronts on face as evaluative nouns, loosely defined as terms included among "the less savory elements of the English lexicon" paraphrasable by an adjective phrase and that can be used both vocatively and referentially. Accordingly, the noun *faggot* is synonymous with the adjective *effeminate*, and can occur both as a call and vocative address, as in the utterances "Hey, faggot, come over here" and "I'm talking to you, faggot." A noun like *faggot*, however, is better considered as an imprecative, a sub-class of socially tabooed evaluative noun used expressly to insult (Allan and Burridge 1991: 117). The other sub-class of evaluative noun is made up of terms that go under the name of *label*, defined as "a means of identifying a person through some particular or distinctive (usually negative) characteristic" (Nuessel 1992: 35). *Bugger*, in the legal sense of a felon guilty of buggery, functions as a label because it stigmatises him by identifying and defining him in terms of the felony committed. Unlike imprecatives labels can only be used referentially, although *bugger* is also used as an imprecative, and as such can also be

used vocatively. As the latter example shows, there is no clear-cut boundary between imprecatives and labels in that the same term may be used for the two functions.

8.5.3.1. Impoliteness through Imprecatives

Imprecatives, referred to in 2.2.1.2.3 as terms of abuse, function as a special type of default name used principally to leave the target in no doubt as to the speaker's dysphemistic attitude to him or her (Allan and Burridge 1991: 117). Since the illocutionary point of using imprecatives, or "name-calling," is to express dislike or contempt for the target, the semantic content of such terms is often irrelevant. When, at the climax of the novel, Ingram Frizer calls Marlowe a "[n]asty Godless sneering fleering bastard," he does not mean that the target of *bastard* was born out of wedlock, the dictionary definition of the term. As an imprecative, *bastard* is practically an expletive, an expression or utterance that gives vent to the speaker's hatred of the target.

Frizer is beside himself with rage when he delivers the insult. His calling Marlowe a bastard exemplifies the use of imprecatives when the speaker is moved to intense anger or disgust by the target. In this respect imprecatives parallel insulting *thou* (Barber 1997 [1976]: 154) to the extent that, like the emotionally marked address pronoun, it signals the momentary loss of self-possession concomitant with aroused emotions. Once in control over his or her emotions, the speaker reverts to a much less impolite form of address. For the parallel between imprecatives and expressive *thou* to be complete, the former must also be used to convey intimacy as well as anger and contempt. Among intimates imprecatives like *bastard* are bandied about in casual conversation to express affection or playful derision. In this context the trading of mock insults, or banter, is a form of verbal horseplay which enhances rather than undermines the positive face of those who indulge in it, reaffirming the rapport existing between them (Leech 1983: 144). Delivered to a non-intimate, by contrast, *bastard* will be received as an unforgiveable affront.

Marlowe and Frizer, however, are enemies so that the trading of insults between them conveys their mutual antipathy. One of the insulting epithets the latter applies to the former is *foul bugger*, a clear reference to Marlowe's sexual preference. After a particularly scandalous bout of love-making with Thomas Walsingham, Marlowe is set upon by his beloved's servant, who in the ensuing confrontation tells him that "[y]ou are no more than a (...) foul bugger" [p.55], an insult hurled on a later occasion in "he is a foul bugger" [p.141]. The point to make here is that Marlowe is not so much called a

bugger as described as one, as the term occurs as the head of the noun phrase functioning as the subject complement of an equational sentence. The semantic content, "one that commits buggery" (OED 1989: 1160 I), is pertinent in the light of the context of the ongoing love affair between Marlowe and Walsingham in which Frizer's utterances are made. *Bugger*, then, ceases to be an imprecative to become a more damaging type of evaluative noun: a label.

8.5.3.2. Impoliteness through Labels

In the definition given in the introduction to this sub-section a label was described as a kind of nickname. Like nicknames labels substitute the recipients' given names when reference is made to them, and more importantly, labels resemble nicknames in that identify their recipients by characterising them in some way. Accordingly, *bugger* characterises Marlowe by identifying him as one given to buggery. The resemblance between nicknames and labels makes it possible to reverse Nuessel's definition by saying that nicknames are a kind of label, particularly derogatory nicknames. One of the two main functions that Morgan et al. (1979: 46) attribute to nicknaming is "the promulgation and sustaining of norms of appearance and behaviour." Nicknames negatively define assumed norms by highlighting deviations from them, and as a corollary stigmatise the deviant (Morgan et al. 1979: 69). As a label *bugger* characterises and stigmatises Marlowe as one that deviates from an assumed norm for sexual behaviour.

What separates labels from nicknames is the much wider currency of the former. Unless the recipient has gained some degree of public prominence, nicknames are restricted to a relatively narrow circle of users. As items of the common vocabulary with fixed, agreed meanings, labels are known to the speech community at large, together with the unfavourably connotations they carry: hence the propensity of some to be used as imprecatives. More importantly, derogative nicknames are typical of a casual style of naming, whereas labelling is to be found in official discourse, and as a result labels belong to a formal style. Terms like *traitor*, *felon*, *heretic*, *madman* and so on, though often used informally, officially label individuals as exhibiting what is perceived to be stabilised deviant behaviour through what Gove (1980 [1975]: 10) terms "status degradation ceremonies." A paradigm case of such a ceremony is the sentencing of someone found guilty of a felony at the end of a trial. In passing sentence, the presiding judge not only ratifies the verdict returned by the jury and imposes the punishment to be

handed out, but also degrades the accused from the status of defendant to that of convicted felon. Accordingly, in the context of the body of legislation against deviant sexual practices enacted in Tudor England (see Smith 1991: 41-53), a conviction of buggery makes the accused a bugger as well as describes him as one. Labelling is in effect a form of performative naming in that it institutes a naming practice: once officially termed a bugger, the recipient can be called one.

Labelling, then, does not attribute a deviant trait to the recipient, but confers it on him or her (Erikson [1962] quoted in Gove [1980: 10]). This relates labelling to the ideological discourses described in 8.2, in particular to the unequal power relations they presuppose. The amplification of Nuessel's definition of label,

> [l]abels are essentially generic names (…) used to specify deviance (…) [and which] may be considered a (…) type of potent nickname, which has a devastating and undesired impact on the oftentimes unwilling recipient (1992: 35),

emphasises the power of those authorised by a dominant discourse to identify those felt not to conform to its assumed norms, as well as the helplessness of those identified as deviants. The reference to the "devastating and undesired impact" on the "unwilling recipient" points to the effect of authorised labelling on face. Labelling does not so much undermine as demolish the recipient's face by reducing him or her to the status of a social outcast.

8.6. Recapitulation

The point of departure for the present chapter is the interpretation of the Narrator's impolite salutation as an informal notation of binarity formulated with the express purpose of interrogating the principle. Drawing on the linguistic insights afforded by the lines from *Macbeth* and *Tamburlaine* alluded to by the antonym pair *fair* and *foul*, the interrogation has centred on the destabilising effect of the dependence of the preferred, marked term of the opposition on the dispreferred, unmarked term for its definition. *Foul* defines *fair* by negating it so that the former is at once external and internal to the latter term. As the interrogation of binarity takes place in a vocative address, *fair* and *foul* are to be read as honorific and dysphemistic epithets respectively so that the binary contrast they express is that of 'polite' and 'impolite.' On this reading, then, the hesitation between the antonyms coupled with the ambiguity of the question posed after the greeting explicitly undercuts the distinction between politeness and impoliteness. Given the onomastic status the noun *reader* acquires, the Narrator's questioning of

binarity also unbalances the naming system insofar as personal names are a key element of social deixis, a system of social identification grounded on the politeness/impoliteness opposition.

Besides the primary identification of their bearers, names are used to indicate social distance and relative power between user and bearer. Taking these two variables as the parameters that determine the constitution of social dyads, two broad types of name and three basic naming patterns can be established. Non-honorific names, more or less corresponding to solidary or intimate *thou*, convey social or emotional closeness, as opposed to honorific names, more or less equivalent to non-solidary *you*, which convey social or emotional distance. Unlike the dual system of pronominal address naming is modelled on, which offers a binary choice between an honorific or non-honorific term, names are ranged along a cline made up of five styles, honorific names being identified with the frozen, formal and consultative styles, and non-honorific ones with the casual and intimate styles. Within the dyad naming may be non-reciprocal, with one member giving a non-honorific name and receiving an honorific one, reflecting the asymmetry of power existing between the members. On the other hand, naming can be reciprocal, characterised by the mutual exchange of either non-honorific or honorific names, indicating equal status and social closeness in the first case, and equal status and social distance in the second.

In relation to face, a non-honorific name attends to positive face at the expense of negative face, and an honorific name respects negative face while prejudicing positive face. To a large extent polite naming consists in striking the correct balance between other's positive and negative face wants based on a successful gauging of social distance and relative power. The failure to estimate these variables correctly will result in the misidentification of other, with the consequent damage to face. Other may be misidentified by being called by non-honorific name when an honorific one is expected, in which case the misidentification will be perceived as an unlicensed intrusion on negative face. Alternatively, if an honorific name is given when a non-honorific one is expected, the misidentification will be perceived as an unwarranted refusal to attend to positive face. Both instances of social misnaming are regarded as a breach of politeness, a set of rules imposed by the context in which the discourse takes place or negotiated by those participating in the discourse to ensure that the participants' face is maintained. No name is polite or impolite *per se*, but in relation to the situation in which it is used.

The idea that face is negotiable is central to Fraser and Nolan's theory of a conversational contract whereby "each party brings an understanding of some initial set of rights and obligations that will determine (…) the limits of the interaction" (1981: 93-4). Having rights and obligations means having a recognised claim to have face maintained in return for upholding the interlocutor's, a view that leads to Scollon and Scollon's redefinition of face as "the negotiated public image mutually granted each other by participants in a communicative event" (1995: 35). It is often the case, however, that one negotiator bargains from a stronger position than the other, notably in social dyads with an asymmetrical power relation. In such cases it is the stronger party that lays down the rules of naming, with the sanction of social custom. Negotiations, moreover, are not always entered into in good faith. Politeness is a code of behaviour, and as such can be manipulated to the impolite ends of the speaker. Both pro forma politeness, identified in *A Dead Man in Deptford* with discretion, and felt politeness, identified with friendliness, can be adopted either to dissemble the speaker's impolite intentions or undermine the recipient's face through insincere or deliberately inappropriate naming, a strategy assisted by the indeterminacy of names in terms of politeness.

9. Politeness and Impoliteness: The Ambiguity of *Kit*

In the previous chapter personal names are described in terms of their function as social deictics. Names are seen to be sensitive indices to social and emotional distance and relative power between user and bearer, and their misapplication, whether accidental or intentional, constitute an affront to the bearer's face. Close attention is paid to the dependence of names on the situational context in relation to their social appropriacy, and their consequent susceptibility of manipulation with intent to insult or mislead. By virtue of the solidarity and intimacy it conveys, *Kit* is a mark of the closeness of the social bond between user and bearer. When no such bond exists, the familiar name functions as a status putdown with a view to belittling or dominating the target (Allan and Burridge 1991: 121).

Passing mention is also made of names as group identity markers, that is, choice of naming style as an index to whether or not the named belongs to the same social group as the namer. Accordingly, casual or intimate *Kit* purports to signal the inclusion of the bearer in the user's circle of friends, and consultative *Mr Marlowe* his exclusion. As Brown and Levinson (1987 [1978]: 107-11) put it, familiar names operate as in-group identity markers, so by the same token titular names function as out-group identity markers. Used appropriately, a casual or intimate naming style enhances positive face by expressing acceptance and appreciation of the bearer, whereas a consultative and formal naming style upholds negative face in by giving due acknowledgement to the bearer's rank or status. Used inappropriately, however, a casual or intimate style violently trespasses on negative face in that it presses the bearer into an alien social group, whereas a consultative or formal naming style shuts out the bearer from a social group he or she feels a part of. Social deixis is therefore concerned as much with encoding membership and non-membership of a social group as distance and power between namer and named.

The dual function of names as honorifics and group identity markers can be related to the two functions of nicknames Morgan et al. establish in their study of nicknaming among schoolchildren. One of these two functions, the promulgation and enforcement of assumed norms of appearance and behaviour, has been already been mentioned in relation to labelling (see 8.5.3.2). The other function is the creation and maintenance of the social order within the group the nicknaming system applies (Morgan et al. 1979: 46). Extended to the naming system in its entirety, personal names not only indicate affiliation or non-affiliation to a social group, they also serve to place their bearers in the hierarchy of the group they are affiliated to. The consideration of names as group

identity markers places the social relations they reflect in a broader perspective than the one adopted in the previous chapter, which was mainly confined to the dyad formed by the namer and bearer. Such dyads do not exist in isolation, but are part of a larger social network of relationships paralleled by the integration of names in a naming system which both reflects and maintains the internal organisation of the social milieu configured by the multilateral relationships it encompasses.

In the light of the outline of names as in-group markers just sketched out, the standard naming convention of calling Marlowe *Kit* creates the misleading impression of acceptance on the part of the characters that address him by the familiar name. As vehicle for the feline conceit, however, *Kit* is slightly dysphemistic in that identification with an animal invariably involves a lowering of status, especially against the background of early Modern scheme of things, which places man above the animals in the chain of being, one of the metaphors through which the Elizabethans structured their hierarchical view of the created universe (Tillyard 1943: 37). This aggravated by the sexual connotations the name acquires through its apophony with *cat* (see 6.1.3.1), which converts *Kit* into a label that stigmatises Marlowe for his carnality and unorthodoxy. In view of this, the name Marlowe is habitually called by does not signal his integration in the society he frequents, but rather his exclusion from it.

9.1. The Creation and Maintenance of Order through Naming

Extrapolating Morgan et al.'s findings on nicknaming to naming in general, personal names contribute to the cohesion of the prevailing social order by encoding the status or rank of the individuals they are applied to, and by identifying and scapegoating those individuals perceived as deviating from the assumed norms which hold the society together. The naming system in operation therefore constitutes a convention which enables the distinction of those who belong to society from those who do not or have been expelled from it, and the rank-ordering of those deemed to be in society according to status, distinguishing those who have a privileges position in the social hierarchy from those who do not. Titular names, broadly identifiable with instances of frozen, formal and consultative styles of naming, make up an honorific system which ensures social stability because their prescribed use signals that the distinctions of rank they encode are duly being observed. Labels, by contrast, condemn those on whom they have been imposed to social ostracism, and labelling may constitute either an instance of formal naming when performed by an authorised speaker in a status degradation

ceremony, or casual naming when performed by means of a derogatory nickname or unauthorised use of an official label. Casual and, more especially, intimate naming styles are associated more with the private rather than public domain, although casual and intimate address forms are used in public, because they convey more an emotional than social bond. The correct reading of the prevailing naming conventions, together with the bearer's adroit management of the names applied to him or her, is consequently an essential social skill for the successful integration in society.

In the manner of illustration of the two functions carried out by naming, the present section will provide a brief outline of the naming system of late Tudor England, as the relation of Marlowe's Via Dolorosa to Deptford Strand covers the late 1580s and early 1590s[1]. "Late Tudor England," it should be noted before proceeding any further, is an example of perhaps the most extensive and most heterogeneous type of social group, namely the nation state, definable as an aggregate of social groupings united by common descent, history, culture or language and inhabiting, or originating from, a particular territory and governed by a common military and administrative power (Abercrombie et al. 2000 [1984]: 234). Late Tudor England, then, constitutes a kind of macro-milieu that contains the various social groups Marlowe is depicted as being affiliated to or in contact with, a social group to be understood loosely as a group of individuals that have something in common. The assumed norms underlying the relationships which inform the milieux Marlowe frequents are all conditioned by the dominant cultural norm of the period, which may be best summed up by what Tillyard (1943) has dubbed "the Elizabethan world picture."

9.1.1. Naming as the Reflection of the Social Order

From what can be inferred from *A Dead Man in Deptford* Burgess's imaginative recreation of late sixteenth-century England conforms to the descriptions of the organisation of early Modern English society given by social historians specialising in this period. The vast majority of the population was fitted in a single status hierarchy inherited from the Middle Ages in which the most fundamental social division was that between the gentleman and non-gentleman, a dichotomy based on the distinction

[1] The *terminus a quo* for the narrative can be safely be established as the summer of 1585. The observation that "[t]here was much mud after long summer rain" [p.36] situates Marlowe's fictional encounter with Thomas Watson, the point of departure of the narrative, a year before the arrest, trial and execution of the Babington plotters (pp.88-91), recorded as taking place in August and September of 1586 (Nicholl 1992: 157-60; Haynes 2004: 173-7). The *terminus ad quem* is, of course, 30th May 1592, the recorded date of the Deptford affray.

between those who did not have to work with their hands and those who did (Stone 1966: 17; Leith 1984: 52; Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg 1995: 550-1). Both gentlemen and non-gentlemen were in turn placed into one of three stations on the basis of status. Accordingly, and in increasing order of social prestige, non-gentleman were classed as dependants (beneficiaries of charity, apprentices and domestic servants), living-out labourers (hired rural and urban workers) and yeomen (husbandmen, freeholders, artisans, tradesmen and merchants), and gentlemen as lesser gentry, county elite (squires, knights and baronets) and the peerage (barons, earls and dukes). Throughout the sixteenth century the traditional status hierarchy, based on the ownership of land (Leith 1984: 52), found itself competing against the increasingly influential occupational hierarchies which emerged in the wake of commercial expansion and growing bureaucratic control, notably administrators, lawyers, merchants and clergy (Stone 1966: 18). The occupational hierarchies opened avenues for social mobility for gifted, or well-connected, but low-status individuals, at first for members of the lesser gentry, but later, thanks to the "educational boom" of 1560 to 1640 (Stone 1966: 44), for the sons of the yeoman class as well. As a result, there emerged a minority of individuals from relatively humble backgrounds which rivalled, and even surpassed, their social superiors in political and economic power, and which subsequently coveted the title of gentleman. The class antagonism that these aspirations generated is reflected in the hesitation in styling a member of the uppermost section of the non-gentleman class as *yeoman* or *gentleman*. Although inconsistent in their application, great store was set by the social distinctions drawn by these terms (Nicholl 1992: 25), and, in view of the high expectations of social mobility raised in yeomen and the lesser gentry, the central concern of late Tudor status-theory was to establish who qualified as gentleman or not (Leith 1984: 52).

The gradations of rank and status are encoded in the titular prefixes and titular names used for social identification. Starting at the top of the hierarchy, and regarding everyday usage, a nobleman is addressed as *my lord* and named *my lord Essex* by social inferiors and socially distant co-peers alike, a knight as *sir* or *Sir Francis* and *Sir Francis* (*Walsingham*), an ordinary gentleman as *sir* or *Mr Walsingham* and *Mr* (*Francis*) *Walsingham*, and a yeoman *goodman*, or, in the case of an artisan or tradesman, the name of the craft or trade he plies (Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg 1995: 550). Those belonging to the two lowest classes, the bulk of the population, lack a titular rank, and are addressed and referred to by forename or family name if acquainted

to the speaker, or by means of default names like *man* or *fellow*. Honorific epithets are likewise graded according to rank. Among upper-class equals the consultative style includes epithets drawn from adjectives describing the qualities associated with elevated social status —*generous*, *gentle*, *gracious*, *honest*, *honourable*, *kind*, *noble*, *reverend*, *worshipful* and *worthy* (Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg 1995: 557)— in line with the positive politeness strategy of remarking on the recipient's admirable qualities without claiming common in-group membership (Brown and Levinson 1987 [1978]: 103). Address forms received from social inferiors combine these honorific epithets with others describing the recipient's benevolence to modify the prescribed status noun, thereby blending positive with negative politeness, as *my right good and gracious lord* (Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg 1995: 576). In return social superiors used honorific epithets that express affection for the recipient, such as *dear* or *well-beloved*, or commend the qualities valued in a faithful servant such as *trusty*, often to modify the recipient's name (Nevalainen, and Raumolin-Brunberg 1995: 587). Underlying the combination of positive and negative politeness that characterises non-reciprocal naming is the ideal of an orderly society in which everybody has their appointed place bound together by ties of both affection and duty. The social order reflected in its finely graded naming system threatens to be brought into disarray by the pretensions of those seeking to rise above their ascribed station and attain the status of gentleman.

The anxiety over the devaluation of gentility, together with the contradictory response this produced, is condensed in "a Mr Thomas Kyd, yeoman not gentleman" [p.242]. The overnice qualification appended to the name denies its bearer the gentility conferred on him by virtue of the titular prefix *Mr*, bringing out the fuzziness of the border separating gentility from non-gentility. The inconsistent withholding of gentleman status is not simply snobbish resentment of the social climber: it betrays a deep-seated fear of collapse into anarchy. The dilution of social distinctions brought about by the downward spread of *Mr* is believed to be a step towards the breakdown of the social order.

9.1.2. Naming as a Means of Social Exclusion

The hierarchical society embodied in its naming system is a reflection of the cosmic order which informs the created universe. As a consequence of the revolt of the evil angels and Adam's first disobedience, however, the divinely ordained universal order is perceived to be under constant threat of wholesale dissolution (Tillyard 1943: 26), an

anxiety captured in the metaphysical excursus in the opening paragraph of the Narrator's prologue:

> There is in us all the solipsist tendency which is the simulacrum of the substantive power of the Almighty, namely what we hold in the eye exists, remove the eye or let it be removed therefrom and there is disintegration total if temporary [p.3].

The identification of the contemplating eye with the divine force which animates the ordered world of Creation in turn prompts the comparison of the annihilation undergone by the contemplated object following the removal of the eye to the obliteration of the cosmic order which would supervene if its Creator were to allow the law of nature to cease functioning.

On earth the counterpart to cosmic upheaval is social disorder, and in human society the responsibility of maintaining order is devolved on the monarch. "The powers that be," as the Apostle Paul stresses, "are ordained of God" (Romans 13: 1). The monarch rules by divine sanction (Whitfield White 2004: 70) so that "[w]hosoever (…) resisteth the power [of secular rulers], resisteth the ordinance of God" (Romans 13: 2). Conversely, the harmonisation of divine with secular authority also means that to question the prescriptions laid down by the Church on belief and worship is to question the authority of the monarch. The resulting conflation of impiety into treachery is expressed in the indignant avowal "I will not hear God and his Church and she that is head of it put down" [p.95]. In Marlowe's England the loyal subject must also be a devout Anglican, a member of the church presided by the reigning monarch, Queen Elizabeth.

The confessional absolutism (Parker 1979: 49) the above-quoted defender of the Anglican Church gives voice to manifests itself in a Manichaean them-and-us worldview, Manichaeism definable as binarism taken to its most extreme. Marlowe, reverting momentarily to the divinity student, neatly sums up the rationale behind this rigidly dualistic outlook in the answer he gives to the question put to him in

> —And hath God an eternal foe? Sir Walter asked.
> —If God exists he must have, Kit said. For the universe, though conceived as one thing as the name saith, yet is properly sustained through the action of opposites [p.139].

God and Satan personify the two irreconcilably opposed and permanently embattled forces that animate the universe. The religious controversy which seasons Elizabethan power politics facilitates the transfer of the eschatological scheme of God's conflict with Satan to the political arena. The world is divided into two warring camps, England

and the Anglican Church on the one hand, and a motley assortment of enemies on the other. Accordingly, the war against Spain is a Protestant crusade against reactionary Catholicism, the persecution of religious dissidents a measure to frustrate Catholic and Puritan plots to overthrow the Church of England, and the inquisition into the activities of free-thinking rationalists a move to forestall atheistic attempts to undermine the Christian faith. England is at loggerheads with Spain, Protestantism with Catholicism, Anglicanism with Puritanism, and faith with atheism. The *primum mobile* is not so much God as his struggle against Satan, waged on earth by his followers against those who have aligned themselves with his eternal foe.

The linguistic equivalent to Manichaeism is a rigidly normative view of language. The Manichaeist presumes the values he or she defends to be absolute, self-evident and incontrovertible, and the prescriptivist assumes the use he or she makes of language to be in accordance with objective standards of correctness, believing that words have single, univocal and, above all, stable meanings, especially those items which make up the terminology of his or her system of values. Semantic univocality is of prime importance for the terms that distinguish those who are "with us" from those who are "against us." The latter type of term is recognisably a label, an out-group identity marker that signifies that the recipient is not only "not one of us" but also *persona non grata* who is to be expelled from society. The imposition of a label mobilises public opinion against the individual it is applied to by highlighting an offending characteristic he or she is supposed to possess, converting him or her into an object of general opprobrium. As a means of social control, labelling ensures the stability of the established order in two ways. First, by identifying dissidents and malcontents, these are exposed and neutralised before their seditious plans can take effect or their pernicious influence corrupt others. Second, the fear of being labelled serves to enforce conformity. The devastating social consequences of labelling, reinforced by the salutary effect of the punishment meted out to offenders, are meant to act as a deterrent for the would-be rebel. Labels emerge as a severe corrective to the illusion of a benignly ordered society created by the emphasis on positive politeness of the conventional address forms used in asymmetrical power relations: they serve as a reminder of the reliance of rulers on coercion to govern their subjects.

Against the background of confessional strife Marlowe comes up against following his entry into government service, the labels used to identify and control the enemies of the state, real and imagined, are *necromancer*, *sorcerer*, *witch* or *warlock*, *Catholic*,

Papist, *Romanish* or *recusant*, *Puritan* or *Brownist*, and *heretic* or *atheist*. Of the labels listed the last is the one that figures most prominently in *A Dead Man in Deptford*, partly because in an age of compulsory religious observance *atheist* is the designation to be avoided most, but mainly because atheism, even more than sodomy, is the stigma that is most firmly attached to the protagonist at the end of the novel. To a large extent the Narrator's relation of Marlowe's tragic progress from Corpus Christi to Deptford Strand narrates the progressively more intimate association of the main character with atheism until *Christopher Marlowe* and *atheist* are virtually interchangeable terms, paralleled by the qualification of his unorthodox views on religion and contempt of the Anglican establishment.

9.2. Two Naming Systems: The Bankside and Seething Lane

Marlowe's alienation from his contemporaries is at variance with the good fellowship suggested by their habitual use of *Kit* as an address form. As stated in 4.1, a key feature of the naming practice applied to him is the rapid adoption of the familiar name soon after meeting for the first time, on the face of it interpretable as acceptance into the social milieu of his new acquaintance. A good example of the ease with which Marlowe is admitted to various social circles is the invitation made by a Captain Fortescue, whom he encounters in a tavern in Rheims: "Do not sit alone. You seem sad. Join the company" [p.58]. Not long after Marlowe's reception Fortescue takes the liberty of addressing him by his familiar name —"Could Christopher, whom he would call Kit by his permission, add aught" [p.60]— apparently an unequivocal sign that he considers Marlowe as part of his group. However, the alacrity with which Fortescue adopts a casual naming style with a total stranger is suspicious, despite the convivial atmosphere reigning in the tavern. The suspicions of the sincerity of his welcome are strengthened when Marlowe recognises him by his voice as the confessor who delivered the homily against sodomy (see 6.3.1 and 6.3.2), later identified as Father John Ballard, the driving force behind a plot to assassinate Queen Elizabeth. The exposure of Ballard's true identity casts his friendly overtures in a new and sinister light. Instead of befriending a solitary young man, Ballard is picking up a likely recruit for his criminal enterprise. Under such circumstances a casual style of address is not so much an indication of Marlowe's admittance into a group as an attempt to entrap him.

Ballard and his cohorts form one of the many social milieux Marlowe makes contact with in the narrative. As he is a spy sent to Rheims to gather information on the

activities of the English exiles resident there, Marlowe is in contact with Ballard's group but not affiliated to it, although his subsequent infiltration gives the impression that he is. Of the milieux he is genuinely a part of the two most important are the playhouse fraternity and the Service, identified respectively with the Bankside and Seething Lane, the sites of the public playhouses and headquarters of the Elizabethan intelligence service. Each of these milieux has developed similar naming systems for the purposes of in- and out-group identification in which Marlowe figures as *Kit*, although the significance the name holds in each differs greatly. In the Bankside the familiar name identifies its bearer as a voluntary affiliate to the playhouse fraternity, whereas in Seething Lane it brands him as an enforced member of the Service.

9.2.1. The Naming System in Operation in the Bankside

Marlowe's affiliation to the playhouse fraternity is stated explicitly in the opening paragraph of Part Two:

> I have Kit much in my sight as a citizen of London. More than that, and indeed in especial, he has become one of us, the playmakers, the feeders with bloody or farcical fodder of the maws of the seekers of diversion [p.117].

The clause "he has become one of us" identifies the Narrator not just as a fellow affiliate but principally as a more veteran one. The self-deprecatory presentation "I was but a small actor and smaller play-botcher" [p.3] in the first paragraph of the book establishes his lifelong association with the public playhouse, first as a boy-actor and later as an undistinguished playwright, and his antecedence over Marlowe in the profession is clearly indicated in

> I saw Kit for the first time in London at Burbage's theatre, named aptly the Theatre, when I played Bel-Imperia in *The Spanish Tragedy* [p.14].

As regards naming, then, the Narrator's purported affiliation to the playhouse fraternity means that his naming practices are representative of the conventions in operation in the Bankside.

In addition, as the Narrator is the purported author of the book, his identification with the Bankside makes it the vantage point from which the narrated events are viewed and through which they are subsequently presented. Since the perspective brought to bear on Marlowe's life is that of a man that has devoted his entire life to the stage, the playhouse fraternity takes precedence over the other milieux depicted in the narrative in that it constitutes the "here" of the deictic centre to which the story world is anchored.

Another point to be borne in mind concerns the "now" of the underlying deictic centre of the Narrator's modelling of the reality represented in his memoir. To begin with, there is the retrospective character of the narrative. The Narrator, the "I" of the deictic centre, is a chronicler of events which affected him in some way so that he sometimes comes on as an actor in his own narrative, though for the most part as a mere onlooker or recipient of information[32]. This places him on a higher ontological plane to that inhabited by the characters he portrays in that, as objects of his reminiscences, they are third-order entities that have existence only in the story-world he creates (Lyons 1977b: 94). As far as this concerns naming, the Narrator *qua* narrator uses names referentially, whereas in the representations the characters' speech names are used vocatively as well as referentially. Consequently, to see to what degree the Narrator's naming practices are representative of the social milieu he claims to belong to, the overview of the naming system that operates in the playhouse fraternity will centre mainly on the referential use of names.

9.2.1.1. *An Outline of Third-Party Naming*

In the narrative proper the general pattern for third-party naming is to refer to the focalised character ―the character that "is presented, observed, listened to, evaluated" (Zubin and Hewitt 1995: 134) by the Narrator― by his full name on first mention and his family name in subsequent references in the passage he appears in. Within this pattern a broad distinction may be drawn between characters that are referred to by the demotic full name ―*Ned Alleyn*, *Tom Kyd* and *Dick Tarleton*― and those by the full name ―*William Bradley*, *Nicholas Skeres* and *Thomas Hariot*. On looking a little closer, the immense majority of the characters named according to the one system belong to the playhouse fraternity, and most of the characters named according to the other system do not. For the Narrator the demotic full name functions as an in-group identity marker, in contrast to the full name, which identifies the bearer as an outsider to the social group the Narrator claims membership to.

There are one or two exceptions to this principle. The most notable is Marlowe, who is referred to throughout the narrative as *Kit*, a practice which highlights the singularity

[32] From the historical references contained in the epilogue [p.269] it seems that the fictive time of narration occurs some time in the 1620s, just over thirty years after Christopher Marlowe's death. The last datable event mentioned is the publication of the First Folio of William Shakespeare's plays by John Heming and Henry Condell, which places the composition of the memoir after 1623. The use of the past tense in the disrespectful allusion to the effeminacy of James I, "the Scotch slobberer that was less of a man than the irritable harridan he replaced," would date it after the king's death in 1625.

of the name, which in turn indicates the pre-eminence attained by its bearer in the theatre world as an author of crowd-pleasers. Another important exception is Philip Henslowe, the proprietor of the Rose: in two passages first mention is made with the full name, and in the others with the family name only. Henslowe is presented as an entrepreneur with his fingers in many pies, the production of plays being only one of his numerous business ventures. The general impression given of him is that he is in the playhouse fraternity but not of it, hence the excluding *Philip Henslowe*.

Turning to third-party naming in the direct speech of characters affiliated to the public playhouse, such meagre evidence as furnished by this source by and large tallies with the Narrator's naming practices, at least as regards other members of the fraternity. The best informant in this respect is Thomas Watson, the character from this milieu who makes the most references to fellow affiliates, namely to Thomas Kyd: "Tom Kyd was a scrivener" [p.19]; and the actor Edward Alleyn: "Jack Alleyn leaves the Unicorn to be with Ned at the Rose" [p.169], the family name elided on account of its occurrence in the demotic full name which identifies his brother. Interestingly, like the Narrator, Watson calls Henslowe by his family name on the one occasion he refers to him:

> Raleigh, Tom said, no, Raleigh is in Ireland planting outlandish tubers, the wizard Earl, no, not he, Alleyn, Henslowe, no [p.172].

The status of *Henslowe* as an out-group marker is corroborated by the double mention of *Raleigh* to refer to someone that clearly does not belong to the playhouse fraternity. What can be gleaned from Ned Alleyn's naming practices chimes in with Watson's, and by implication the Narrator's: Kyd is likewise referred to by the demotic full name, "we must make do with this thing of Tom Kyd's" [p.166], as is Marlowe's would-be emulator Robert Greene, "And there is Robin Greene coming up with the two friars and the comedy of devil-raising." On the only occasion Marlowe is referred to by a fellow member of the playhouse fraternity by name, Thomas Nashe, it is by his familiar name: "He gets at Kit another way" [p.225]. On balance, then, the Narrator's naming practices are consistent with the convention discernible in the choice of names exercised by characters identified as members of the Bankside.

To conclude this sub-section, it should be noted that the dual naming system outlined here carries social connotations as well. What the Narrator calls "the playmakers," stage actors and playwrights, constitute a group that is not integrated in the status hierarchy that structures Elizabethan society (Stone 1966: 17). On this account, the use of the demotic full name to refer to members of this group also serves to mark off the

playhouse fraternity from the rest of society, identifying the Bankside as a world apart. Outside this world the fuzzy distinction between gentlemen and non-gentlemen is reflected in the naming practices applied to non-affiliates. Yeomen-gentlemen are called by the full name followed by the family name, as described above, while knights and peers tend to be referred to by their corresponding titles.

9.2.1.2. *An Outline of Address Styles*

The use of the demotic full name as an in-group identity marker suggests the reciprocal use of the familiar name to address fellow members of the playhouse fraternity. On examining the represented speech of these characters, however, this expectation is not completely fulfilled. Although there is evidence of mutual casual or intimate address, there are also social dyads in which are more distant style is employed. These differences, as Morgan et al. (1979: 56) report of schoolchildren's nicknames, shade in the social map of the Bankside, pointing to the cliques, friendships and tensions which exist within the milieu.

Reciprocal familiar-name address can articulate either a close friendship or a mutual acknowledgement of commonality of interest. The reciprocity of *Kit* and *Tom* inferred from their occasional uses for vocative address disseminated throughout the text identifies the relationship between Marlowe and Watson as friendship:

> We need money, Tom, and Henslowe and Alleyn will not take it [p.166]
>
> Kit, I must go my wife [p.197].

Conversely, the reciprocity of *Kit* and *Ned* seems more to signal the professional solidarity of colleagues than the emotional intimacy of friends:

> —Have a care with what you are doing, Kit, Ned said [p.144]
>
> Well, there it is, Ned, tell me later what you think of it [p.145].

The distinction between the two relationships is based on the greater frequency and diversity of interactive contact between Marlowe and Watson on the on hand, and the common background they share on the other. Marlowe and Watson are university men with an interest in poetry who write stage plays for a living, whereas Alleyn was born and bred in the playhouse world. Whenever Marlowe and Alleyn meet, it is to talk shop; while Marlowe's relationship with Watson is essentially a working partnership, they have a sufficient fund of shared experiences to deal with other topics other than the business of playmaking. Reciprocal *Kit* and *Tom* is therefore describable as casually

intimate in that it expresses both an emotional and solidary bond, over against the casually consultative style of reciprocal *Kit* and *Ned*, expressive of a solidary recognition of in-group membership, though not of emotional involvement.

Alleyn is the only member of the playhouse fraternity that is on first-name terms with Henslowe, who comes across as someone doubtfully belonging to this social milieu. Accordingly, the reciprocal casualness suggested in

> And you, Ned, shall help with the planning and the design of it [p.17]
>
> Fear not, Pip, all may yet be well [p.179].

contrasts with the non-reciprocal formality in

> I see you pull your beard with some dismay, Mr Watson [p.17]
>
> —Neutral, Watson said. You know too much, Henslowe.

The closeness between Alleyn and Henslowe is traceable to the actor's marriage to the impresario's stepdaughter. One of the consequences of the union is to make Alleyn Henslowe's business partner, indicated by the deference shown by the latter to the opinion of his prospective son-in-law regarding the building of the Rose by inviting him to take part in the venture. Its exclusiveness marks reciprocal *Ned* and *Pip* off from the reciprocity of casual address operative within the playhouse fraternity, signalling that the members of the social dyad form a privileged clique within the milieu. Alleyn's double alliance with the man who capitalises the public playhouse invites a new reading of reciprocal *Kit* and *Ned*. It is also casually consultative because of the asymmetrical power relation between the playwright and the son-in-law and partner of the man who pays him for his plays.

Although integrated in the theatre scene, Marlowe is not on first-name terms with all its affiliates. With Thomas Kyd and Robert Greene mutual no-naming seems to be the norm, which points to the tension which troubles Marlowe's relationship with the two on account their envy for the resounding box-office successes he brings off. On one occasion, however, Greene addresses him by the mild imprecative *pup* in the threat "[be] on guard, pup" [p.149], echoing Kyd's dismissive evaluation of Marlowe as "one these university puppies that think they know better" [p.15]. Despite the canine associations of *puppy*, the mild imprecative evokes the same image of impotence and vulnerability conjured up by the feline conceit which frames Marlowe, particularly in the form of the drowning-cat metaphor. Marlowe reciprocates Greene's hostility by referring to him by his family name instead of *Robin Greene* whenever he mentions him

to other affiliates of the playhouse fraternity. By calling him *Greene*, an out-group identity marker, Marlowe symbolically strikes his enemy off the roll of denizens of the Bankside.

9.2.1.3. *Divergences from Established Naming Patterns*

Recapitulating on what has been said in 9.2.1.1 and 9.2.1.2, one can discern a fairly clear pattern of naming in the narrative based on a binary contrast in which the demotic full name is in opposition to the full name. The basis of the opposition is the bearer's membership of the social milieu the Narrator purports to belong to, identified as the playhouse fraternity. Thus, *Tom Kyd* is marked as in-group, and *Thomas Hariot* unmarked.

However, the Narrator's naming of characters is often not consistent with the structural principle underlying the system. Characters not belonging to the playhouse fraternity are frequently referred to by the demotic full name and familiar name, and characters that do by the full name and family name. Many of these inconsistencies can be accounted for. In many cases the inconsistent name occurs in instances of free direct or indirect speech written into the narrative so that the namer is one of the characters, who may use a different naming system to the one the Narrator resorts to. For instance, in the following sentence, taken from a passage describing Marlowe's arrival in Flushing,

> [a]nd on the quay indeed was Baines, Dick Baines, with a horny hand to greet but no welcome in the face that was too thin and watchful [p.105]

the Narrator relays the self-introduction Baines makes as he receives Marlowe as he disembarks from the ship which has carried him from England. Some cases of inconsistent naming are attributable to mimicry, the reproduction or distortion of observed behaviour, often with the intent to express an attitude towards the character mimicked (Galbraith 1995: 39). For instance, *Clean Robin* in "Clean Robin appeared, a marvellous proper man, they would say" [p.42], in which Robert Poley is focalised for the first time, picks up the irony of Nicholas Skeres's prior reference to him in "Clean Robin will shrug but not everybody will shrug" to cause the reader to mistrust the named character. Other instances of inconsistent naming are nevertheless explicable neither in terms of free direct or indirect speech nor mimicry, notably the references to Thomas Walsingham as in-group identifying *Tom Walsingham* and *Tom*, and Greene as out-group identifying *Robert Greene* and *Greene*.

A possible explanation for these in congruencies is that the names do not reflect the Narrator's naming system, but Marlowe's. The poet-spy is in love with Walsingham, and at daggers drawn with Greene, feelings which account for the naming style used for each character. The shift in naming practices accompanies the change of perspective resulting from the transitions to and from first-person exposition and third-person narration which occur throughout the book. The Narrator does not limit himself to relating the fluctuations of fortune undergone by the subject of his memoir, but seeks to convey Marlowe's experience of the vicissitudes which befall him through the representation of the thoughts and feelings they provoke in him. The projection of third-person subjectivity is justified from the epistemological point of view by the insistence on the conjectural nature of the relation of Marlowe's life through the repetition of the clause "I suppose" in the narrative frame. The Narrator is therefore more a speculating than reminiscing subject who hypothesises how Marlowe might have reacted to the events he was involved in, as well as "the heap of happenings" his chronicler admits not having "eye to eye knowledge of or concerning" [p.3] in the prologue. A measure of the Narrator's empathy with Marlowe is his ability to perceive the protagonist's relationships with others as the dramatist viewed and experienced them, reflected by the adoption of the naming practices Marlowe is likely to have used.

9.2.1.4. *Trajectories Observed in Inconsistent Naming*

Looking at little more closely at the instances of inconsistent naming identified in 9.2.1.3, one becomes aware of slight variations in the way the characters affected are named. Of the two the naming of Greene is the more constant. Contrary to the convention observed in the playhouse fraternity, described in 9.2.1.1, the Narrator avoids the in-group demotic full name when referring to Greene, preferring the family name and, on three occasions, the out-group full name. This, on the other hand, is consistent with Marlowe's practice of referring to him as *Greene*, and no-naming him when speaking to him. Marlowe's choice of naming is indicative of his antipathy to Greene, and the Narrator's adoption of the naming style of his sympathy for Marlowe; the constancy of the naming practice reflects the persistence of the bad blood existing between Greene and Marlowe.

Turning to Walsingham, one notices a shift from consultative to intimate naming style. From Marlowe's first encounter with him to their reunion in Rheims Walsingham is referred to as *Thomas Walsingham*, *Walsingham*, and occasionally *Mr Thomas*

Walsingham and *Mr Walsingham*, in keeping with the convention for the third-party naming of non-members of the playhouse fraternity. After they have made love for the first time, there is a change of style: from then on the Narrator refers to him as *Tom Walsingham* and *Tom*, the practice reserved for affiliates to the Bankside. The transition is made in the aubade following the first session of love-making: "Walsingham, now merely a Tom, another to clog our narrative, was spread on his bed snoring" [p.50]. The transition from *Thomas Walsingham* to *Tom Walsingham* reflects the decrease of social distance between Marlowe and Walsingham as a result of their becoming lovers, equivalent to the displacement of reciprocal non-solidary *you* by reciprocal solidary *thou* between acquaintances that become friends reported by Brown and Gilman (1960: 258; 1989: 178). Again, although inconsistent with the norm with regard to naming observed in the playhouse, the switch is consonant with Walsingham's addressing Marlowe as *Kit* in return for *Tom*. It is interesting to note that in the epilogue the Narrator reverts to the full name when referring to Walsingham for the last time: "I saw Thomas Walsingham knighted" [p.269]. This strongly suggests that *Thomas Walsingham* is the name the Narrator would ordinarily have chosen, but his empathy with Marlowe has prompted him to take up the demotic full name.

Another feature of the Narrator's naming of characters meriting notice concerns *Tom* in reference to Thomas Watson. There is nothing inconsistent in calling him by the familiar name, as Watson is part of the world of the playhouse, but the fact that the uses of *Tom* tends to be concentrated in specific episodes is eye-catching, if not unusual. One episode describes Marlowe's traumatic discovery that his friend has married without telling him:

> Kit, entering, saw (…) Tom (…) frotting away in full nakedness with a wench or woman or lady, naked too, the covers of the bed all fallen, clothes hastily doffed mingled with the rushes of the floor. Kit excused himself and felt sick. On a table in what Tom called his study, he found four, five, six copies of a thin book with the title *Gaza* (…) Tom Watson entered girdling his nightgown about him, his face thunderous. Kit excused himself anew, blame Ralph. Tom said he had already buffeted him out [p.70].

Another episode narrates Watson's sword-fight with William Bradley,

> Tom ran to the ditch which was a border to a field where the windmills turned lazy and indifferent (...) Tom saw a drunken canvas-climber cry *Codardo*. ... Tom would leap the ditch. Bradley staggered on its edge, recovered, Tom struck him on his beard so that blood enlivened the thistlefield of it [p.167],

Tom being the predominant form of naming him in the subsequent passages concerning Watson and Marlowe's arrest and committal to Newgate. What the two passages have in common is their emotional intensity. The sentence "Kit (…) felt sick" in the first fragment, moreover, marks the impress of his subjectivity on the depiction of the scene he inadvertently witnesses. The uncomplimentary reference to Watson's wife as "a wench or woman or lady," and the unflattering description of the couple's love-making as "frotting away," suggest disgust and, as the reader discovers later, betrayal. In this light the shift to *Tom* is analogous to the use of expressive *thou* to convey contempt: the familiar name here points to a serious crisis in Marlowe and Watson's relationship. Similarly, the use of the familiar name expresses the strong emotions Marlowe experiences during the sword-fight and its aftermath, this time anxiety over his friend's safety. As the two episodes under review show, the interpretation of the feelings Watson arouses in Marlowe depend, as Brown and Gilman (1960: 275) say of expressive *thou*, heavily on the co-text of *Tom*. In any case the use of the familiar name for dramatic effect lends further support to the impression that the Narrator has subordinated his naming convention to Marlowe's.

9.2.2. The Naming System in Operation at Seething Lane

Since the Narrator, unlike Marlowe, belongs only to one social milieu, the naming conventions observed in the Service have to be inferred from the names its members use to address and refer to one another. As a semi-official body run by a senior member of the government, the organisation Marlowe joins has a more formal hierarchy than the playhouse fraternity because of its clearly defined chain of command. At the top there is Francis Walsingham, the "lord of the Service." Immediately below him are Thomas Watson, his chief recruiting officer; Thomas Phelippes, his assistant in the daily running of the organisation and master forger; Robert Poley, *agent provocateur* later promoted to liaison officer; Thomas Walsingham, courier and Marlowe's chaperone; and Nicholas Faunt, another of Francis Walsingham's couriers. At the bottom is the irregular army of snoops and spies into which Marlowe is introduced, and which include permanent fixtures such as Nicholas Skeres, Poley's bodyguard, and Richard Baines, *agent provocateur* and informer. The naming styles employed in this milieu are in principal determined by the place occupied by namer and named in the pecking order. Following Francis Walsingham's death, name choice also serves to indicate the varying alignments

that emerge from the power struggle triggered by the resultant vacuum of power, and which precipitates his downfall.

9.2.2.1. *The Recourse to* Friend *for In-Group Identity*

From what can be inferred from the naming practices employed by Francis Walsingham's servants, in-group identification through onomastic means indicates more membership of a clique or friendship within the Service understood as a social milieu than affiliation to the Service as such. This is in part because of the large number of personnel on Walsingham's payroll and the clandestine nature of the work they are engaged in, which impedes fraternisation among them, and in part because of the hierarchical social structure of the Service, which enforces the observance of distinctions of rank and seniority. The most likely candidate for a general in-group identity marker for the Service is the term *friend*. When Walsingham acknowledges that Marlowe knows his friends [p.104], *friends* is used to refer to those working for the spymaster in general, and those with whom his subordinate is in contact in particular. Marlowe himself is frequently addressed by his colleagues as "friend," though the term is soon revealed to be a double-edged one. Ostensibly *friend* is resorted to as an appeal to his solidarity and loyalty; but as the doubts as to his reliability become increasingly persistent, the in-group identity marker is used more and more as a call to order, with an insinuation of the baleful consequences of what will happen to Marlowe if he proves not to be a friend.

As seen in 7.2, *friend* denotes various types of relationships based on the principle of reciprocity. What Walsingham has in mind when he speaks of Marlowe's "friends" is the useful friend, one of the three types of friend Aristotle distinguishes. Utilitarian friendships, the philosopher goes on to contend, come about among people that have a common interest and can exist without their liking one another (2000: 146). The prevalence of solidarity over affect in such friendships is effectively conveyed in the Narrator's representation of Richard Baines's reception of Marlowe at Flushing, already quoted in 9.2.1.3. The solidarity implied in the casual self-introduction *Dick Baines* and the goodwill betoken by the handshake is offset by the mistrust that can be read clearly on Baines's "thin and too watchful" face. The cold welcome extended to Marlowe sets the tone for his incipient relationship with his contact: there is to be comradeship without camaraderie between them. Marlowe's off-putting acceptance to Robert Poley's

protestation of friendship, referred to in 8.3.2, also highlights the absence of genuine fellow-feeling among the members of the Service:

> Oh, Kit, Kit, are we not friends? And with the change of tone the cat began purring.
> —Of a kind, yes. But not of the playman kind.
> —Let that pass, there are friends and friends [p.203].

The retort, as argued in the prior examination of the passage, is at the same time an assurance of solidarity and a withholding of liking, recognised by Poley's "there are friends and friends." Marlowe considers his superior as his friend to the extent Poley can offer him protection from those who wish to proceed against him on account of his alleged atheism, while Poley regards Marlowe as his friend as long as his subordinate is amenable to the demands he places on him. Poley sums up their bargain in the oration that ends their interview:

> You may take it that (…) your friend Robin Poley will be steadfast in the old policies and have power enough, and that Kit Merlin will do his old work when he can [pp.203-4].

The tension between Marlowe and Poley highlights the double-coding of *friend* in the context of the Service. Calvo (1991 [1990]: 35), following Fill (1986), defines a double-coded utterance as one in which the intended message is different from the ostensible message. Ostensibly, Poley's entreaty "Oh, Kit, Kit, are we not friends?" attends to Marlowe's positive face by its purported assurance that he is not only regarded but also appreciated as a member of his social circle. At a deeper level, however, it trespasses on Marlowe's negative face by reminding him of the lifelong commitment that binds him to the Service. The double-coding of *friend* is already perceptible at Rheims, when Marlowe is still a raw, untested recruit. "Fortescue's" drinking party is momentarily interrupted by the arrival of Thomas Walsingham, who on being asked the reason for his presence there explains

> I am here with my friend. (He stroked Kit lovingly.) To help ease the torment of decision [p.61].

The meaning of *my friend* is not quite the same for "Fortescue" and his cronies as for Marlowe, who has been invited to join them. Whereas to the former the phrase is intended to signify a bond of affection and like-mindedness between two boon companions, to the latter it serves as a reminder of whose side he is on. As Walsingham freely admitted on finding Marlowe out, his mission in Rheims is to spy on him so as to

keep him out of trouble [p.48]. Keeping Marlowe out of trouble involves among other things preventing him from going over to the enemy.

Marlowe's growing intractability results in a marked increase in the appeals to his friendship from his colleagues. The origin of Baines's litany of "not friendly" is Marlowe's announcement that he considers himself "[n]o longer in the Service" [p.163]. Each successive reminder of his unfriendliness is a broad hint that he is not toeing the official line, inviting him to reconsider his unco-operative attitude before his superiors are forced to take action against him. Baines's "[y]ou are not friendly" [p.164] and "[t]hat is not friendly" [p.165] are as a result open to the charitable interpretations of 'you are not being friendly' and 'that is not being friendly. That is to say, Marlowe's unfriendliness is a temporary aberration susceptible of correction. "That is not friendly" is in fact the last thing Baines says to Marlowe, in response to an insult from the latter as they pass each other at Westminster [p.246]. Their brief but ill-natured encounter takes place just as Marlowe is leaving the examining chamber after his interrogation by the Privy Council, and Baines entering to give evidence against him. This time, however, the statement is an unequivocal declaration that Marlowe is incorrigibly unfriendly and is to be treated as an enemy.

Nicholas Skeres's insincere "[f]riends, Kit, thou art thou and I to thee am thou" [p.191] is likewise a means of reining in an unreliable agent in response to Marlowe's unenthusiastic resumption of intelligence work. And the greater his recalcitrance, the more insistent the appeals to his friendship become, revelatory of his colleagues' growing alarm and impatience at his waywardness. Despite the irritation it betrays, the continued use of *friend* signals the hope that Marlowe is not beyond the pale. Even at Widow Bull's, when Marlowe's credit with the Service is all but spent, Skeres redoubles his insincere efforts to offer him friendship in a last-ditch effort to enlist Marlowe's co-operation. The point of no return is intuited in the following exchange between Marlowe and Poley:

> —I think I must be done with the Service. It was unseemly to think on a bargain.
> —There is no bargaining, there never is. We do our duty and there are no reservations, also few rewards. You must not say you are done with the Service. Ponder the consequences of that. You know too much [p.261].

Skeres alludes broadly to the consequences of breaking faith with the Service once it is clear that Marlowe has ignored Poley's final warning:

> —What dost thou do, Skeres asked, with a quill pen that is past sharpening?

—Do you really require an answer?
—Good, thou knowest.
—I am not thou.
—Very well, you. *You* are not anything [p.266].

By turning down Poley's request to reconsider his decision to leave, Marlowe is ceases to be an asset to the Service, albeit a depreciable one, to become a substantial liability, forfeiting the title of *friend*. Utilitarian friendships, so Aristotle (2000: 146) says, dissolve when they no longer offer mutual advantage to the parties involved: in the cut-throat world of espionage the dissolution of a partnership demands the elimination of one of the parties. Skeres pronouncement that "[*y*]ou are not anything" is in effect of declaration of excommunication, underscored by the shift from mock-intimate *thou* to socially distant *you*, prior to the sentence of death implied in the reference to the quill pen: Marlowe has already ceased to exist socially even before Frizer puts an end to his physical existence. Like the quill pen he has outlived his usefulness and is only fit to be thrown away.

9.2.2.2. *The Demotic Full Name for In-Group Identity*

Although *friend* has currency as the all-purpose in-group identity marker in the Service, with the meaning "one of our own," there is evidence of the demotic full name performing this function as well. Baines's self-introduction as *Dick Baines* in Flushing, repeated in the reminder "[t]he name being Dick Baines" [p.163] in an apparently chance encounter at Deptford, has the effect of conferring the status of in-group identity marker on his demotic full name. On each occasion *Dick Baines* acts as a kind of shibboleth which enables namer and named to recognise one another as members of the Service whenever they meet. The name consequently identifies Baines as a Walsingham man at the same time it acknowledges Marlowe as one as well.

To count as an in-group identity marker, *Dick Baines* should be used to refer to its bearer, and *Dick* to address him. However, on the two occasions he makes reference to Baines after meeting him, Marlowe uses the more impersonal *Baines* to signal dislike, as he does with *Greene* (see 9.2.1.2). When speaking to Baines, moreover, Marlowe resorts to a no-naming strategy, reciprocated by his interlocutor. What can be deduced from the naming convention between Marlowe and Baines points to a general trend in the social milieu of the Service, which is the inconsistent use of the demotic full name as an in-group identity marker. Robert Poley, for instance, refers to Thomas Watson and Thomas Walsingham as *Tom Watson* and *Tom Walsingham* on the only occasion he

names them, suggesting that the demotic name is the habitual referential form for his two colleagues. Yet in return he is referred to as *Poley* by both Walsingham and Watson, although the former does reciprocate with *Robin Poley* on one occasion. Nor does the dispensation Poley gives to Marlowe to call him *Robin* induce him to refer to his superior as *Robin Poley*. Marlowe addresses him by the familiar name, in compliance with Poley's request, but continues to refer to him as *Poley*.

Of all the people in Francis Walsingham's employ Watson is the man most consistently referred to by the demotic full name by his colleagues. Both Thomas Walsingham and Poley refer to him as *Tom Watson*, as does Marlowe when he mentions him to the other two. Accordingly Marlowe, explaining the reason for his presence in Seething Lane to the younger Walsingham in

> Well, sometimes through compliments to me fools think they may reach my high-placed cousin. You came another way.
>
> —Through Tom Watson. A chance meeting, a common concern with poetic trafficking. I am lodging with him [p.32],

uses the demotic full name for his mentor in the certainty that, having just been inducted into the Service, that the three of them belong to the same social milieu. Walsingham, in answer to the question "[a]re you too in what he calls the Service?" [p. 31], gives out that his cousin "uses me at times, not often," Watson recruits Marlowe with the promise that "[t]here is money in spying" [p.13], and Marlowe is the new boy on the block. In this regard *Tom Watson* is used as much to assert the namer's affiliation to the social group he has just joined as to identify the named as a member of that group.

Dispatched to Rheims to see how Marlowe is faring on his first mission, Walsingham relays some of the things Watson said to him about the fledging spy in the interview held after the two young men had become acquainted:

> My grave cousin was mumbling of Morley and Marley and Merlin, but Tom Watson said Kit was enough [p.48]
>
> Tom Watson said you were a pretty sort of fighter in taverns
>
> Tom Watson said you were shouting about the greatness of Machiavel in some eating house or other [p.49].

From what Walsingham says about what Watson said about Marlowe it is clear that Marlowe's mentor gave a full account of what his protégé had got up to on the eve of his induction, creating the impression that Watson had been keeping a mental dossier on the candidate agent since running into him at Cambridge. This also fosters the suspicion

that Walsingham sees through Marlowe's Platonic defence of male-male love (see 6.2.4.2) not because he is especially perceptive, but because he was informed of Marlowe's sexual proclivities beforehand, as Marlowe discloses his homosexuality shortly after making Watson's acquaintance (see 7.1.3). In-group *Tom Watson* not only identifies its bearer as one of Francis Walsingham's spies, its use also shows him to be as diligent in noting down Marlowe's foibles as Baines is.

The suspicion that Watson takes an active part in the monitoring of Marlowe's movements is strengthened by Poley's reference to him by the demotic full name in the following exchange with the object of his surveillance:

> —You lodge with Tom Watson? Poley asked, out in the wind of Temple Bar.
> —No longer. He said he would not marry but he has married. The sister of this lawyer Swift. I ride tonight to stay with Tom Walsingham. But I shall be in early, as you request.
> —From Tom to Tom [pp.83-4].

The application of the same naming style to both Watson and Thomas Walsingham suggests the same degree of collusion between the named exhibited in Walsingham's staggered and condensed report of Watson's profile on Marlowe. The removal from Norton Folgate to Scadbury is interpretable as an expedient conducive to having the new agent under tighter if discreet supervision by placing him in the charge of the person with a stronger hold on him. With Watson Marlowe has "a common concern with poetic trafficking," but he is hopelessly in love with Walsingham. Poley's quip, "[f]rom Tom to Tom," underscores the impression of entrapment created by this reading of the passage: Marlowe may change lodgings, but he still remains in the discreet custody of the Service.

Marlowe's return to Watson's haunts is a re-enactment of from Tom to Tom, though in reverse. Coming down from Cambridge, he is described as moving into

> Bishopsgate Street at the corner of Hog Lane, not far from Tom Watson's dwelling, though Watson was now a tutor to the son of William Cornwallis in their great house in the Bishopsgate region (spying too belike, since the Cornwallis family was Catholic, and with the smell of the Spanish invasion about, such had to be watched) [p.117].

The theory that Watson has been planted in the Cornwallis family strengthens the view that Marlowe is included under "such had to be watched" as well. In the guise of neighbour and collaborator Watson can have Marlowe under observation while the latter is temporarily retired without arousing his suspicions. Also, when they are both on remand in Newgate for the killing of William Bradley, Marlowe is made to realise that

Francis Walsingham is the only person he can turn to for the forty pounds that will bail him out through a process of elimination initiated by Watson

> —Bail money? Where shall I find that?
> —Raleigh, Tom said, no, Raleigh is in Ireland planting outlandish tubers, the Wizard Earl, no, not he, Alleyn, Henslowe, no (…)
> —God help me, it will have to be Walsingham, Kit said thickly with drink [pp.172-3].

In return for putting up the money for securing his release, as Marlowe is fully aware, he must go back to espionage. When Nicholas Skeres arrives with the news that the bail money has been raised, he greets Watson as *Tom Watson*, signalling his continuing affiliation to the Service and giving rise to the suspicion that he may have induced Marlowe to fall back on his former employers for help.

The status of *Tom Watson* as an in-group identity marker in the Service as well as the playhouse fraternity gives grounds to suspect that Watson is not the disinterested friend he appears to be. In this he resembles Thomas Walsingham, the *femme fatale* Marlowe mistakes for his soul mate. The two men in Marlowe's are both implicated in ensuring that he does not leave the Service, and the duplicity they practise to accomplish this mission is another manifestation of the twin-ship evoked by the etymological meaning of their common forename.

9.2.2.3. *Naming Practices Indicating Friendship Sets*

An apparent omission from the foregoing account on the use of the demotic full name among those in the Service is the consistent use of referential *Robin Poley* by Nicholas Skeres. Yet because Skeres is the only character to name Poley this way, the naming practice is more a reflection of their personal relationship than their respective standing in the organisation they both serve. The nature of this relationship is touched on when, at the scratch mission briefing at Dover, Poley tells Marlowe that Skeres "goes with me to Paris, chiefly as my protector" [p.44], later corroborated by Skeres himself: "I (...) see myself as (...) [t]he bodyguard of Robin Poley and now his daily messenger while he is in the Tower" [p.92]. As Skeres and Poley spend much of the time together, the resulting interactive closeness creates enough intimacy for them to be on first-name terms. Poley, it will be observed, sometimes refers to his henchman as *Nick*. Although their association comes about as a result of their work, the Skeres-Poley duo constitutes a special relationship within the framework of the Service.

However, *Robin Poley* alternates with *Robin*. At Dover Skeres refers to him as *bonny sweet Robin* and *Clean Robin* [p.42], at the execution of the Babington plotters as *bonny*

Robin [p.93], and at Deptford as *the awakened Robin* [p.264]. Judging from "[s]queamish, you could call [Poley]" [p.92], the endearing epithets prefixed to the name act as a thumbnail character assessment of Poley, ironically amplified by "bonny sweet Robin (...) is a clean man (and he tapped the *clean* to emphasise his own dirt) and washes himself in clean cold water" [p.42]. The contrast between Poley's cleanliness and Skeres's dirtiness suggests a tendency in the former to shirk the moral responsibilities ensuing from his involvement in the "dirty business for keeping clean the realm," stated more clearly in the comment that Poley was "happy that he was not there to witness the outcome of his dealings and double-dealings" [p.92], and admitted in "[i]t is a precept of Machiavelli that you must never see the bloodier consequences of your acts" [p.177]. Skeres's status putdown "[y]ou're a young beginner" nevertheless provides another gloss on the mock-intimate style with which he refers to Poley. His use of *Robin* is meant to signal that Skeres fully belongs to an organisation to which Marlowe has been admitted only on probation. Until he has proved himself an able and loyal agent, Marlowe cannot be said to be a true member of the Service and so be entitled to be on first-name terms with its affiliates.

Another instance of Skeres's recourse to casual or intimate third-party naming to affront Marlowe's positive face is his naming of the latter's enemy as *Ingram*. The reference to Frizer by his forename is impolite in that it delimits a social circle from which Marlowe is shut out on account of his animosity towards one of its members. Skeres's attempt at conciliation with Marlowe,

> —Friends, Kit, thou art thou and I to thee am thou. With Ingram here the case may well be different [p.191],

leaves no doubt as to his awareness of the longstanding enmity between Marlowe and Frizer, giving grounds to distrust the sincerity of his offer of friendship. Frizer's reciprocation of *Ingram*, "Nick Skeres too" [p.256], strengthens the doubts on Skeres's insincerity by confirming the existence of a friendly rapport between them.

Apart from subtly presenting a united front against Marlowe at the Deptford meeting, reciprocal *Ingram* and *Nick* marks out the existence of a friendship set within the social network of the Service. Thomas Walsingham adverts to their association on his arrival at Rheims:

> We were waiting to spy on Poley, but Poley seemed to be there to start spying on us. And there was this dirty man with him, a cutthroat, what was his name, Frizer?
> —Nicholas Skeres.

—An old acquaintance of Frizer's, it seems, but I do not enquire further [p.48].

The mystery surrounding the relationship of Walsingham's manservant with Poley's bodyguard is cleared up when it later transpires that they are confederates in Frizer's business scams. The revelation that they have been "coney-catching" [p.190], the cant term for swindling people out of their money, is an impolite explanation of what they have been up to. It is impolite in that the use of in-group language before outsiders, as Marlowe is to the world of making easy money, is a means of social rejection by emphasising the division between the initiated and uninitiated (Allan and Burridge 1991: 196; Culpeper 1995 [1994]: 357). As with his association with Poley, Skeres's partnership with Frizer involves a degree of interactive closeness which gives it a special status within the context of the Service, especially on considering that they team up to conduct their fraudulent transactions when they are off duty. In like manner Marlowe's relationships with Thomas Watson and Thomas Walsingham go beyond the confines of the Service so that reciprocal *Kit* and *Tom* also articulate distinct relationship sets. Yet since Watson and Walsingham are both Marlowe's watchdogs as well as his friend in the former case and his lover in the latter, the friendship and romance are overlaid and vitiated by the relation of the spy with the spied-on.

Their status as Marlowe's custodians is underwritten by Watson and Walsingham's special relationship with the head of the Service, in turn reflected in the naming conventions applied in each. Francis Walsingham generally refers to his subordinates by their family names and adopts a no-naming strategy when speaking to them, and is referred to by deferential *Sir Francis* or neutral *Walsingham* and reciprocated with the no-naming strategy when spoken to. By and large Watson adheres to this norm when acquainting Marlowe of the Service, although at one point he boasts about being his on first-name terms with the spymaster, "I will tell you of Sir Francis, Frank as I call him" [p.12], and even takes the liberty of punning on his name: "Do not try your pretty word-play with Frank Walsingham. He is a plain man" [p.13]. The claim to intimacy, substantiated by recollections of being befriended by Walsingham in Paris at the time of the St Bartholomew's Day massacre, is borne out at Marlowe's induction, where Watson is addressed by his forename: "Walsingham sourly released a smile as if he must pay dearly for it, saying: Eh, eh, Thomas?" [p.28]. Watson is seen to enjoy Walsingham's trust and regard, which, in the light of the full report on Marlowe he delivers after the audience, strengthens the suspicion that he is not altogether upfront with his protégé. Being related to the spymaster, Thomas Walsingham refers to him by

the kinship term *my cousin*, usually prefixed by the epithet *grave*. The comment that Francis Walsingham "is grave but not to be taken gravely" [p.31] strongly suggests that his younger kinsman is being ironic, an indication of his privileged position in the Service. Despite the confession that "my cousin (...) pounds at me like an uncle," Thomas Walsingham is deemed competent enough to be entrusted with delicate missions, including that of making sure that Marlowe does not defect to the Catholics at Rheims. Like Watson's suave and slightly pedantic manner, betrayed momentarily by the shrill anti-Catholic diatribe he delivers after meeting Marlowe, Walsingham's languid flippancy is a role to be assumed to disarm any suspicions Watson's new recruit may harbour. Marlowe's delivery into Walsingham's care allows Poley's witticism to be read in a new and sinister light: "[f]rom Tom to Tom," in the context of his entry into government service, makes reference to the transaction whereby Tom Watson picks Marlowe up at Cambridge and hands him over to Tom Walsingham.

9.3. *Kit* as an Expression of Enforced Association

Marlowe's voluntary entry into Francis Walsingham's service entails the unwitting surrender of his freedom. "Once in the trade," as Nicholas Skeres tells him, "you will not be out of it" [p.42]. As a symbol of his binding commitment to "the Queen, and her holy Church" [p.26], the new recruit to the cause is addressed by the familiar form of his forename, succinctly put by Thomas Walsingham with the following words: "[m]y grave cousin was mumbling of Morley and Marley and Merlin, but Tom Watson said Kit was enough" [p.48]. Watson and Walsingham —the man who encourages Marlowe to join, and the man who induces him to stay— conspire separately to define his status as a captive rather than a member of the Service by setting a naming fashion to be adopted by those affiliates who have regular dealings with him. In spite of the constant reminders of the indissolubility of the bond that ties him to the Service, Marlowe is slow to realise that he has effectively relinquished his freedom in swearing his allegiance to the cause he, with increasing reluctance, serves. As relations with his colleagues worsen, so the frequency with which *Kit* is used increases in an effort to restrain an agent that is more and more difficult to control. In the context of the Service the familiar name becomes a symbol of its users' intent to dominate its bearer.

As a means of domination *Kit* reveals as much about the user as it does the bearer. It identifies the namer as one that seeks to dominate Marlowe so that the higher the frequency with which the name is used, the greater the implication of the namer in the

intent to subjugate Marlowe. Consequently, as the most frequent users of *Kit*, Walsingham, Robert Poley and Nicholas Skeres are revealed to be the most importunate of Marlowe's tormentors, and ultimately to have the greatest responsibility for his death. Their joint complicity in the murder of Marlowe is reflected by certain correspondences in the naming practices they each impose on their victim, namely the exaggeratedly effusive style of address and of granting dispensation to be on first-name terms. It is this common naming style that reveals the collusion among these three characters, complementing reciprocal *Nick* and *Robin Poley* on the one hand, and offsetting the absence of reciprocity between *Tom Walsingham* and *Robin Poley* on the other.

9.3.1. Repetition in Naming

The feature common to Walsingham, Poley and Skeres's casual naming of Marlowe is the tendency to repeat an item when they address him. In the case of the first two the repeated item is the familiar name, with the difference that Walsingham invariably triplicates the name,

26. Which is Kit, so you are Kit, come Kit, Kit, Kit [p.32]
    Come then, Kit, Kit, Kit, you see I have remembered the name [p.48]
    It is all very simple, Kit Kit Kit [p.49]
    Oh Kit Kit Kit, you know where,

while Poley tends to duplicate it,

27. Kit Kit Kit, you will never be free [p.189]
    Oh, Kit, Kit, are we not friends? [p.203]
    Kit, Kit, we are friends [p.212].

Judging from these utterances, Walsingham and Poley are a little too demonstrative in expressing their affection for Marlowe, with the result that their expansiveness comes across as more overbearing than friendly. Consequently, more than attending to their interlocutor's positive face, they are imposing on his negative face.

On seeing the utterances just cited in context, Walsingham and Poley's oppressive cordiality turns out to be a ploy to soften the threats they make to Marlowe's negative face by means of the positive politeness strategy of using in-group identity markers to claim common ground. With the exception of the first utterance grouped under [26], the repetitions of *Kit* accompany a remonstration, an affront to the recipient's face in that it implies that he is wrong, misguided or unreasonable (Brown and Levinson 1987 [1978]: 66). For example, "[i]t is all very simple, Kit Kit Kit" implies criticism of Marlowe's

obtuseness, and “Kit Kit Kit, you will never be free” of his naïvety. As it tends to be repeated when its bearer is being chided for his ignorance or perverseness, *Kit* is as much an interjection as a vocative. The repetition of the name expresses the speakers’ amused contempt of Marlowe while identifying him as an individual that needs to be humoured, needled, cajoled or bullied into compliance as occasion demands. As a result, *Kit* is downgraded from a positive to a negative in-group identity marker indicating that the named claims the interest, but not the appreciation, of the namers.

The pejorative change undergone by *Kit* is most patent in the power game played by Skeres after Marlowe’s grudging return to government service. Unlike the utterances grouped under [26] and [27], the repeated item in his familiar addresses to Marlowe is *friends*:

28. Friends, Kit, thou art thou and I to thee am thou [p.191]
Friends, friends, again and again friends, Skeres said. May we thou and thee? May you be called Kit [p.256]?
You are something of a poet. Is he not, Mr Christopher, oh I will say Kit, we are all friends [p.264].

Although not used as a vocative form, *friend*, as argued in 9.2.2.1, nevertheless functions as a default in-group identity marker in the context of the Service, identifying the person it is applied to as someone that is on the same side as the speaker. The co-occurrence of the term with *Kit* and the *thou* of intimacy not only acknowledges Marlowe as Skeres’s friend, it also operates a change in its meaning. From the utilitarian sense of ‘ally’ *friend* is now meant to signify ‘trusted and esteemed companion.’ On the face of it, then, Skeres is seeking to re-establish his relationship with Marlowe on a more amicable footing than has hitherto existed.

The switch from non-committed *you* to intimate *thou*, however, strongly suggests affectation, and therefore insincerity. That Skeres is being disingenuous becomes patent when the first utterance in [27] is seen in context:

—Are all drunk this night save myself? said Kit rising and seeking to push his way out. Skeres pushed him back to sitting. He said:
—All friends here. I take it thou wilt spend Yule with a dog in the manager.
—I am not thou.
—Friends, Kit, thou art thou and I to thee am thou.

Skeres’s adoption of the intimate style of address supervenes the act of physically preventing Marlowe from leaving, a violent paralinguistic affront to face that wipes out the politeness conveyed by his assurances of friendship. Skeres adds insult to injury by insisting in addressing Marlowe in the intimate style after the rebuff “I am not thou,”

the use of inappropriate identity markers being one of the positive impoliteness strategy (Culpeper 1995 [1994]: 357). Marlowe's forcible detention and the unlicensed intimacy of *Kit* and *thou* both serve as a pointed reminder of Poley's playfully admonishing "Kit Kit Kit, you will never be free." Once back in the Service, in other words, Marlowe will not be allowed to leave again, and it is Skeres's task to see to it that he will not.

The badly feigned amity of *thou*, *Kit* and *friend* therefore symbolises a claim on Marlowe the Service have no intention of waiving. It is not out of any regard of his qualities as an agent that they are so anxious to keep him, but rather fear of his indiscretion, frankly stated in Poley's "you are not to be let loose to blather among playmen and others." The act of holding Marlowe is a warning of the lengths they are prepared to go to prevent him from leaving the Service and betraying their secrets to their enemies, vaguely alluded to by the "others" Poley mentions. The threat of retaliation is nevertheless not the only means the Service use to ensure that Marlowe stays on. As indicated in 9.2.2.1, Walsingham's explanation "I am here with my friend. (He stroked Kit lovingly)" is a double-coded message warning Marlowe against defecting to the Catholic *émigrés* in Rheims. However, the parenthetic clause gives to understand that persuasion rather than force is the means to be employed, the caresses being a token of the pleasures Marlowe would forgo if the suspected defection were to take place. The verb phrase *stroked lovingly* evokes the feline conceit embodied by *Kit*, more specifically in its avatar of the alternately petted and maltreated cat. Persuasion and coercion are different means to the same end, namely Marlowe's retention in the Service, aptly illustrated by Poley's treatment of his cat during his tense meeting with Marlowe (see 5.3.2): stroking can easily become striking. The feline conceit is evoked again in the battle of wills Marlowe and Skeres engage in on account of the latter's over-familiarity, this time reincarnated as the struggling cat. Marlowe's unsuccessful attempts to get Skeres to desist in calling him by his familiar name enact, given the connotations of captivity acquired by the in-group identity markers applied to Marlowe, his equally unsuccessful, and ultimately fatal, bid to escape from the Service. His failure is highlighted by his resigned acquiescence to Ingram Frizer's request for permission to address him familiarly:

> —May I too say Kit? Frizer asked from the daybed.
> —As you please. I have small dignity to maintain [p.264].

Shortly afterwards Marlowe is dead, stabbed precisely by the last man to solicit his friendship. His compliance with Frizer's request, cued in by Skeres's "oh, I will say

Kit," signals the metamorphosis of the struggling into the drowning cat. Having stopped struggling, Marlowe can but only sink.

9.3.2. The Intimate Style of Address as a Means of Domination

In opting for the casual-intimate naming style, Walsingham, Poley and Skeres exercise their power over Marlowe. Their decision to address him as *Kit* is accompanied by the dispensation to reciprocate with *Tom*, *Robin* and, albeit implicitly, *Nick*, which, as indicated in 8.4.2.1, is another manifestation of their power. If Marlowe addresses Walsingham as *Tom*, it is because he has been licensed to use the intimate style, not because he has decided of his own accord to do so. In calling Marlowe *Kit*, Walsingham, Poley and Skeres in effect seek to gain control over him; and in having him reciprocate with *Tom*, *Robin* and *Skeres*, they seek to maintain the control they have established.

Walsingham calls Marlowe *Kit* from the very outset of their association. Indeed, practically the first thing he does on making Marlowe's acquaintance is to establish the naming convention for his new friend: "so you are Kit, come, Kit, Kit, Kit" [p.32]. In 7.3.5 it was seen that the feline connotations of *Tom* and *Kit*, by gendering their bearers masculine and feminine respectively, invests Walsingham's the power to name with the power to assign sexual roles in the romance he has with Marlowe. As an agent of his cousin's intelligence service, the power to name reflects the ascendancy of the custodian over his ward, later reinforced by the influence of the patron on his client. Walsingham therefore exercises multiple power over Marlowe: that of male over female, lover over beloved, patron over client, and above all keeper over charge, all expressed through the imposition of *Kit*. The dispensation to be called *Tom* is given just as they are about to make love for the first time: "[Frizer] has his duties to perform, bed-making and ordering dinner. And Kit and Tom can be free" [pp.48-9]. Up to this moment Walsingham, through the Narrator's empathetic naming of him, has been named by a less intimate style. The stage of physical intimacy their relationship now enters, signalled by the Narrator's clarification in "Walsingham, now merely a Tom" [p.50], renders the familiar name more appropriate. However, as sex is the means through which Walsingham dominates Marlowe, the switch from *Walsingham* to *Tom* also sets the seal on his dominance on the man he has seduced.

With Poley the switch from consultative to casual naming is more accelerated than the gradual process suggested by Brown and Gilman. At Dover he addresses Marlowe

by his family name, "[s]o, Marley or Morley, we are to go together on the morning tide" [p.42], as is proper between people that have just made one another's acquaintance. Yet by the time they reach Calais he has already given Marlowe dispensation to address him casually: "Poley, who had asked to be called Robin, was rosy and smiling and unscathed by the voyage" [p.45]. The next time he addresses Marlowe Poley accordingly uses his familiar name, "[d]ear Kit" [p.81]. The dispensation is renewed, somewhat curtly, when Marlowe reports to him on rejoining the Service:

> my dear Kit, it has been so long, I have had a hard time, I know the hell of imprisonment and I have had the rigours of much travel in the cause, thank God we are together again, call me Robin.
> —Robin, Kit said doubtfully, well, sir, and so I call you Robin.

Marlowe's hesitant reply echoes York's response to the address of his elder brother, just after he has been proclaimed king:

> Richard of York! how fares our loving brother?
> Well, my dread lord; so must I call you now
> (*Richard III* III i 95-7).

As Repogle (1987: 177) says, the Duke is correct as he has to show additional deference to his brother following the latter's elevation. The construction the allusion puts on Marlowe's hesitation is that he takes Poley's dispensation as an obligation rather than an invitation, underscored by the honorific default vocative *sir*. Although a familiar name, *Robin* is as much a submission to authority as *my dread lord* is, an impression strengthened by the fact that the dispensation is delivered as an unredressed imperative.

Skeres's addresses to Marlowe present an abrupt change in naming style, from impolite no-naming to unctuous, and therefore equally impolite, intimacy. Each style is related to one of the two stages into which Marlowe's career as a spy is divided. In the first stage, centred mainly on the dismantling of the Babington plot, Marlowe is referred to contemptuously as "a young beginner," no-naming resorted to as a means of emphasising the distance between veteran and rookie. In the second stage, centred on the activities of the Protestant lunatic fringe, the dispensation contained in "thou art thou and I to thee am thou" is ostensibly acknowledgement of equal status by a veteran to a fellow veteran. The change of demeanour can not only be pin-pointed in, but also explained by "Skeres greeted him familiarly with *Kit Merlin*"[33] [p.175]. The encounter takes place at Newgate, where Marlowe and Watson have been committed on a charge

[33] Italic script in the original.

of homicide. Skeres brings the news that the money to bail him out has been raised by through the good offices of the Service, followed reference to Poley's pleasure at hearing Marlowe's "eagerness to be back at work." The message is in effect a notification of Marlowe's return to active service, and the switch to the casual style of address a speech act effectuating the reclamation of a long-absent servant by his masters.

The radical change in Skeres's naming style runs parallel with the change undergone by Marlowe's relations with the Service. Marlowe voluntarily joins, swayed by Watson's promises of easy money and opportunities for advancement, although his enthusiasm is soon dampened by the dishonesty and cruelty of their methods. His return to espionage, by contrast, is a form of repayment for the assistance given him by the Service, and therefore undertaken unwillingly. The knowledge that he has resumed his old duties from force of circumstance rather than of his own accord causes his employers to redouble their efforts to retain Marlowe. Skeres's unlicensed familiarity, then, is a form of badgering him into compliance; the in-group identity markers employed act as reminders that he is in the "dirty business of keeping clean the realm," and that he "will not be out of it."

9.3.3. Common Naming Style as an Indication of Collusion

The manner in which their naming styles echo each other suggests collusion on the part of Walsingham, Poley and Skeres. The repetition of *Kit* gives grounds to suppose that Walsingham and Poley are acting in concert, even though in the narrative they are depicted together only once. The co-occurrence of *Kit* with *friends*, on the other hand, points to a close working relationship between Poley and Skeres, already expressed by the reciprocity of *Robin Poley* and *Nick*. Skeres's over-familiarity, one suspects, is prompted behind the scenes by Poley as a means of keeping pressure on Marlowe. The similarity in naming styles not only bring out the complicity which exists between them, it also defines their respective roles in the continual harrying of Marlowe, not mention his death.

The close correspondences between the utterances in [26] and [27] are an intimation of a stronger connection between Walsingham and Poley than appears at first sight. Another, though much less obvious, pointer to their collaboration involving the naming of Marlowe is the prefixing of an endearment to the vocative name. This feature is

apparently characteristic more of Poley's than Walsingham's style in that the former resorts to it on five occasions,

29. Dear Kit, dear helper in the cause and most helpful a helper [p.81]
my dear Kit, it has been so long [p.176]
You must listen with care to all I now say, dear Kit
do not think we can with impunity be cheated, dear Kit
Dear Kit, you must proceed to Edinburgh [p.177],

over against the single use of the latter: "Dear Kit. After so long" [p.180]. However, as the page numbers suggest, four uses of *dear Kit* occur in the same conversation, namely Marlowe's first meeting with Poley after his release from Newgate. On seeing the four addresses in context, it becomes apparent that they bracket a string of face-threatening acts, once the welcome extended to a long-absent friend gives way to the sober realities of business:

> my dear Kit, it has been so long, I have had a hard time, I know the hell of imprisonment and I have had the rigours of much travel in the cause, thank God we are together again, call me Robin.
> —Robin, Kit said doubtfully, well, sir, and so I call you Robin.
> —You must listen with care to all I now say, dear Kit. You owe us, you know that.
> —The forty pound will come back to you in December.
> —There was cheating that time in Flushing, do not think we can with impunity be cheated, dear Kit.

The first address introduces, after the preliminary pleasantries are over, the high-handed dispensation to call Poley *Robin*, the imposition of first-name terms being a symbolic repossession of Marlowe. The second serves as a reminder of the debt Marlowe has incurred with the Service, "[y]ou owe us," followed by an indirect reprimand for a past misdemeanour, "[t]here was cheating that time at Flushing," and a veiled threat of the consequences if he plays false with them again, "do not think we can with impunity be cheated, dear Kit." The reprimand doubles as a correction, another face-threatening act, indicating that the debt Marlowe owes him is not, as he supposes, just a monetary one. The succession of *dear Kit* have the effect of punctuating, and therefore highlighting, the consecutive threats to Marlowe's face, which are performed in order of increasing gravity: a reminder of an obligation, a conjoined correction and reprimand, and a threat.

The last address, "[d]ear Kit, you must proceed to Edinburgh," introduces the assignment Marlowe is to carry out and his marching orders: to take ship at Deptford, where he will be picked up by his travelling companion, someone enigmatically described as "able to assume high rank" [p.177]. Marlowe's fellow traveller turns out to Walsingham, who greets him with "[d]ear Kit. After so long." Taken at face value, the

greeting expresses Walsingham's joy at seeing his estranged lover again after a prolonged separation; but as it echoes Poley's earlier salutation "my dear Kit, it has been so long," it is contaminated by the latter's use of *dear Kit* to underline the face-threatening acts he performs against Marlowe. The suspicions this raises, that Walsingham and Poley are secretly in league against him, are strengthened by the authorial comment that Walsingham "showed no surprise at Kit's coming; the disclosure of travelling companion had been one-sided" [p.180]. This presupposes not only that Walsingham has been in conference with Poley regarding the mission, but also that they are working in collusion against Marlowe.

Further corroboration of their complicity is that the reciprocal use of their respective demotic full names, in-group identity markers, is made in relation to the travelling arrangements for the Edinburgh mission. After greeting Marlowe, Walsingham informs him that "I have bespoken a night's lodging for us at Mistress Bull's," identified as the wife of "a foul Puritan that brings filthy Puritan print from Middleburg," despite which "Robin Poley that hates Puritans does not hate Rob Bull." Mistress Bull's is the victualling house in which Marlowe is to be murdered so that their lodging there before embarking for Edinburgh links Walsingham to his lover's death. The connection becomes stronger, and takes on a more sinister tone, when Poley invites Marlowe to Mistress Bull's to discuss the latter's future:

> I sail out from Deptford and sail back thither. Let us meet on May the thirtieth. You know the house, Tom Walsingham tells me [p.235].

Poley repays Walsingham the compliment of referring to him earlier as *Robin Poley*, but the main point to stress concerning Poley's reciprocation is that it is centred on Mistress Bull's house. What is more, the invitation is made at Scadbury just after Thomas Kyd denounced Marlowe as an atheist. Poley, most probably informed of Marlowe's imminent summons to the Privy Council, turns up at the Walsingham estate and "greeted Tom Walsingham friendlily and with a superior affability slapped Frizer on the back." In-group *Tom Walsingham*, reinforced by *friendlily*, gives grounds to suspect that the reason for Poley's visit is to discuss with his host what is to be done with Marlowe, the outcome being the proposal to talk things over at Mistress Bull's. On this interpretation Walsingham, despite his earlier announcement that "there will be no more orders for me when I play the Lord of the Manor" [p.180], is revealed to have a share in the decision-making with regard to Marlowe, as well as a direct responsibility for his death.

The suspicion that Walsingham has a hand in the murder of his friend is confirmed by the echoes of his assurances that Marlowe will not be executed with those given by Poley. On the eve of the Deptford meeting Walsingham guarantees that the "poet of *Tamburlaine* will not have his guts wrenched out" [p.251], in reference to the execution of traitors by hanging, drawing and quartering. The following day, only hours before the murder, Poley gives the same assurance, though less graphically: "You will never go to the gallows, Kit" [p.261]. Their assurances are also alike in that they are both highly equivocal: Walsingham and Poley state that Marlowe will not be executed publicly, but not that he will not be killed off. The ambivalence of their assurances is exposed by Skeres's pronouncement that Marlowe is "in the situation of one that is no proper criminal, unmeet for trial and hanging," and therefore of one "that had best be voided" [p.266]. That is to say, Marlowe is to be put to death in secret because a public trial and execution might bring to light many things which would reflect negatively on those with whom he has had dealings with, notably Walsingham and Poley.

In his capacity as judge in the improvised kangaroo court set up to pass sentence on Marlowe, Skeres performs the role of Poley's hatchet-man. Before he delivers his oration on the necessity to have Marlowe "voided," Skeres seeks Poley's permission to do so:

> —Listen, Skeres said, and looked to Poley for approval. Poley nodded.

The go-ahead belatedly clarifies the evasive answer given to Marlowe at Dover apropos of Skeres's cryptic "Clean Robin will shrug but everybody will shrug" [p.42]:

> —Skeres said something about shrugging. Shrugging things away. What does he mean?
>
> —It is the two stages of leaving the Service. Shrugging is the first, the second is not shrugging [p.44].

If *shrug* is substituted by *nod*, the verb governed by *Poley* in the quote further above, then it becomes apparent that leaving the Service is death at a signal given by Poley. Poley therefore emerges as the man that decides whether Marlowe is to live or not, and that, once the decision is made, decides the moment when Marlowe is to be dispatched. Skeres is the man picked out to ensure the implementation of what Poley has decided, whether it is to bring Marlowe to heel through unlicensed familiarity or prepare his killing. Walsingham's contribution to the murder is to allow Frizer to assume the role of Marlowe's hangman.

The impression that Skeres is acting under Poley's orders is borne out by the response given to Marlowe's refusal to pay for the bill Skeres presents him with for the fare provided them during their stay at Widow Bull's:

> —You jest, Kit said, and it is sour. I was invited. The reckoning is not mine.
> —Not altogether jest, Skeres said. There is a reckoning to be made [p.265].

Since the bill has already been made up, the reckoning to be made refers to another debt Marlowe owes. The double-coding of "[t]here is a reckoning to be made" is the same as that of Poley's "[y]ou owe us," identifying Poley as Marlowe's creditor, and Skeres as the dun sent to collect the debt on his behalf. Skeres's announcement also prepares the definitive expulsion of Marlowe from the Service expressed by "[*y*]*ou* are not anything. In the minutes left to him before he is dispatched Marlowe is not addressed by in-group *Kit*, the last words he hears being Frizer's imprecatory "[f]ilthy sodomite. Filthy buggering seducer of men and boys. Nasty Godless fleering sneering bastard," all the descriptions unequivocally out-group labels.

9.4. Recapitulation

Marlowe's retort that he and Poley are not friends "of the playman kind" adverts to the difference that underlies the naming conventions of the Bankside and Seething Lane as regards politeness. Whereas in the former social milieu naming is a good guide to the tenor of the relationship between namer and named, in the latter it misleads by creating an illusion of solidarity and amity that glosses over the namer's distrust and suspicion of the named, particularly with respect to the bad faith which characterise Marlowe's dealings with his colleagues in the Service. In the playhouse fraternity *Kit Marlowe* identifies him as "one of us, the playmakers" while in the Service the name conveys "we have him, and we will not let him go." The impression that casual naming style means keeping possession of the named instead of granting entrée into a social circle is expressed by Skeres's warning that "not everyone will shrug (...) [a]t a man's coming and going and following his own desires, as they call them" [p.42]. Expressed in terms of the feline conceit, Marlowe, unlike the philosopher's cat evoked by "a man's coming and going," may mew to be let out but, having mewed to be let in, will not be allowed to leave. More precisely, Marlowe is free to wander, but all his movements are closely watched in case he makes a false move, and he is made to know that he is never out of the sight of the Service. The constant surveillance his colleagues place him under in turn evokes the prowling-cat metaphor embodied in *Tom* through the homophonous relation

of the name with the male gender marker for *cat* (see 7.1.2). Marlowe is the wandering but superintended cat, and his ever-vigilant colleagues of the Service, the predatory toms that stalk him; and *Kit* is a reminder that he has masters he must obey and serve, and that will punish him severely if he attempts to run away from them.

10. The Appropriacy of *Christopher*

The previous chapter centred on the solidary and proprietary uses made of *Kit* in the playhouse fraternity and the Service respectively. Despite the different social meanings it acquires in each social milieu, the marked preference for the familiar name in both milieux is at the expense of *Christopher*, greatly underused by Marlowe's acquaintances irrespective of whether they are well or ill-disposed to him. In this chapter it will be argued that the avoidance of the forename is due to the perception of its inappropriacy, a concern which places the focus definitively on the content of names. To a large extent the examination of the schemes involving *Kit* carried out in the first part of this thesis, though starting from its form, is admittedly a study of how it acquires the connotations of nonconformity, paederasty, profanity and necromancy through the semantic contagion of the familiar name by the terms it is phonologically bound to. Unlike *Kit*, however, *Christopher* already has a meaning, although it seems to be scarcely consistent with the perceived personality of its bearer. Rephrasing Cratylus' dig at Hermogenes, alluded to in 2.1.4, 'Christ-bearer' does not hold for a dramatist reputed to be an atheist, sorcerer and sodomite. The disparity between the etymological meaning of *Christopher* and Marlowe's reputation is related to the issue of the correctness of names discussed in the *Cratylus*, and for this reason it will be the central concern of the present chapter.

10.1. The Etymological Meaning of *Christopher*

In Christian hagiography *Christopher* is the title conferred on Offerus, a convert who is said to have carried Christ in the form of a child across a raging stream and later suffered martyrdom (The Catholic Encyclopaedia, 2005). The legend is taken to be an allegory of the hardships Christians must endure because of their faith and the need for fortitude to endure and overcome them. Since his namesake is the patron saint of travellers and a martyr, *Christopher* is an apt name for Marlowe insomuch as he is constantly on the move and eventually suffers persecution and death for his views. Save for these trivial coincidences, the name is felt to be a singularly ill-chosen one, given his much advertised contempt for religion. Marlowe is no model of Christian faith and fortitude in adversity, and his violent death is viewed as condign punishment for a vicious reprobate. On the whole, and in the light of the Marlowe-the-cat conceit, *Christopher* is seemingly more of a misnomer than a name in that it belies Marlowe's supposedly depraved and irreligious nature. In some respects, however, the connotations of endurance carried by Marlowe's forename renders it appropriate. The incongruity

between what *Christopher* signifies and its bearer's scepticism in times of confessional absolutism makes the name as much of burden as a profession of faith in times of oppression.

There is more to Marlowe's embarrassment than the discrepancy of an agnostic bearing a name containing *Christ*. His discomfiture bulks large in his reference to the avoidance of his forename:

30. To lose all that is or was Christopher Marlowe. I have a great name, though not many call me by it. I bear Christ on my back. And who or what is Christ [p.252]?

The despairing question at the end of the utterance traces his agnosticism to the impossibility not only of knowing who Christ is, but also of ever being enlightened on the question. The feeling of aporia evoked by the realisation, resonant of the Narrator's question on the difference between *fair* and *foul*, is reflected by the variations undergone by the etymological meaning of his forename on the three occasions it is mentioned in the narrative:

31. I see the first name is Christopher and a good name, one who bears Christ on his back, but what is this other? [p.27]
32. Not in the Bible either, but who would not be a bearer of Our Lord Jesus Christ on his back? Well, Christopher, drink [p.59]
33. I sit here, and you two gentlemen sit either side of the carrier of Christ [p.265].

Each of the three paraphrases of 'Christ-bearer' is made by a different character: the first by Francis Walsingham, a Protestant bigot; the second by Father Ballard, a Catholic fanatic; and Nicholas Skeres, an unprincipled individual without any definite beliefs. Each recasting of the etymological meaning may be regarded as representing different conceptions of Christ, particularly as regards Walsingham and Ballard. They are both fully convinced of the soundness of their image of Christ and the unsoundness of that of the other, in spite of their common belief that he is the Son of God and the Saviour of humankind. In view of these two conflicting visions of Christ, with nothing to recommend them other than the conviction that they are true and self-evident, it is little wonder that Marlowe should despair of ever discovering who Christ really is.

The question of appropriacy of *Christopher* is therefore placed within a frame of religious dissension as enacted by Walsingham and Ballard. Its significance hinges on the meaning of the title revealed by the etymology of the name; but as there are competing meanings of *Christ*, there is no way of ascertaining the true significance of *Christopher* either. If the name does not sit well with Marlowe, it is not because his perceived personality is at variance with what it signifies, but because it is not at all

clear what it signifies. The whole question of whether or not *Christopher* is an apt name for him turns out to be an insoluble one.

10.2. Conflicting Views on Christ

Given their bearing on the issue of the appropriacy of *Christopher*, the different renderings of the etymological meaning of the name given in extracts [31]-[33] will be discussed first. The discussion is premised on the assumption that the first rendering reflects the Protestant image of Christ and the second the Catholic one, while the third is divested of sectarian associations. The comparison and contrast of the three renderings provides a context against which Marlowe's agnosticism can be defined with greater clarity.

10.2.1. The Protestant Rendering of Christopher

As the approving comment "and a good name" indicates, *Christopher* is regarded as an auspicious name by Walsingham. To have a recruit named so is at once confirmation of the righteousness of the cause the spymaster defends and an effective invocation for divine favour. Marlowe's missions to mainland Europe, moreover, involve him crossing the English Channel, just as St Christopher serves God by helping travellers across a fast-flowing stream, a comparison supported by the rough sea passages described in the missions to Rheims [pp.45 & 63], Paris [p.71] and Edinburgh [p.182].

The prepositional phrase *on his back* is another allusion to Marlowe's namesake. The adverbial calls forth the implications of suffering and staying power carried by *bear*, suggesting the asperities and dangers entailed in defending the Protestant cause from its Catholic enemies. This emphasis on the need for abnegation and self-sacrifice is very much in keeping with the militant character of Protestantism, in particular the Puritanism which Walsingham professes. Also in keeping with the Protestant temper is the bare reference to Christ by his title. The bareness of *Christ* reflects the doctrinal simplicity of Protestantism: personal salvation does not come through the institutional and sacramental expedients offered by the Catholic Church, but through the firm belief that Christ died for the redemption of humanity's sins. The image of austerity and robustness conjured up by Walsingham's gloss on Marlowe's forename conveys the Protestant virtue of absolute faith in Christ.

Despite the favourable associations that *Christopher* has for him, Walsingham never calls Marlowe by his forename. Thomas Walsingham, dispatched to Rheims to keep an

eye on Marlowe, relates to his charge the spymaster's inability to remember his family name:

> My grave cousin was mumbling of Morley and Marley and Merlin, but Tom Watson said Kit was enough [p.48].

As Marlowe's superior, Walsingham has a choice: he can refer to his subordinate by his family name to indicate rank, his forename to show condescension, or adopt a no-naming strategy to emphasise the difference in rank that separates them. His preference for Marlowe's family name certainly indicates a sense of the importance of observing precedence within the hierarchy, but the avoidance of the forename also suggests that Marlowe is not the asset to the Protestant cause as Walsingham's reading of *Christopher* would give to understand.

10.2.2. The Catholic Rendering of Christopher

The main difference between Ballard's rendering of *Christopher* and Walsingham's lies in the complexity of the name phrase they contain. Whereas the Puritan spymaster simply uses the title, the Jesuit priest resorts to a construction in which the bearer's forename is sandwiched between two titles: the messianic honorific placed behind *Jesus* in the manner of a byname, and the nobiliary politeness marker consisting of a status noun limited by a possessive determiner. The greater elaboration of Ballard's name phrase, with its strong aristocratic connotations, would reflect the Catholic insistence on hierarchy and ceremony, precisely the values downplayed or denied by Protestantism. The use of the first person plural in the politeness marker also merits comment, as it departs from naming conventions applied to the nobility. Reference to members of the peerage is, as indicated in 9.1.1, made with either the first person singular possessive, *my Lord*, or the third person singular possessive and *Lordship*, to give *His Lordship*. The change in the formula, given the inclusiveness of *Our*, would express the Catholic Church's claim to universality, already implied by the term *Catholic*.

Another important difference of Ballard's rendering is that it is cast as a rhetorical question. In this respect, since the preferred answer is "no one," the priest implicitly concurs with his persecutor in thinking that *Christopher* is "a good name." The wording of the question nevertheless seems to imply that to be a bearer of Christ is a distinction some would rather avoid rather than embrace, serving as a reminder that *bear* means 'endure' as well as 'carry'. To carry Christ accordingly entails suffering for his sake, again exemplified by St Christopher's martyrdom. The idea that the profession of faith

involves suffering and death may be regarded as reflecting the status of Catholicism as a persecuted minority religion in Elizabethan England, an impression that is borne out by Ballard's eventual arrest, torture and execution. This does not apply to Marlowe, however. As an agent of Walsingham's he is collaborating in the plot to bring Ballard and his associates to the gallows and therefore an accomplice to the priest's martyrdom, again rendering *Christopher* an inappropriate name for him.

It is not surprising that, like Walsingham, Ballard does not call Marlowe by his forename. After addressing him as *Christopher* once, the priest switches to the familiar form of the name:

> Could Christopher, whom he would call Kit, add aught, he had the look of a poet [p.60].

The dropping of *Christopher* for *Kit* may, as suggested in the introduction to 9.2, be interpreted as a ploy to make Marlowe a Catholic proselyte. Addressing him by his pet name renders him more approachable, and as a result more amenable to persuasion. On the other hand, Ballard's preference for *Kit* may also express an intuited realisation of the inappropriateness of *Christopher*, as the priest's insinuation that Marlowe is not what he appears to be shows penetration. Although a student of divinity, Marlowe's true vocation is poetry, a disposition divined by the priest despite the poet's disguise of an aspiring seminarist. Since poetry is one regard an outpouring of the poet's inner life, the intimacy conveyed by *Kit* makes it a more suitable form of address than *Christopher*, which accords better with the militant Christianity which both Walsingham and Ballard espouse.

10.2.3. The Non-Sectarian Rendering of Christopher

Skeres's rendering of *Christopher* differs from that of Ballard's in the choice of agentive noun. The difference can be extended to Walsingham's rendering in that the verb he uses is the base of the noun Ballard uses, *bearer*. Unlike its synonym *bear*, the base of *carrier* does not have the connotations of resignation under adversity. The absence of any implication to fortitude may be due to Skeres's indifference to the points of doctrine which separate the Catholic from the Reformed churches, or simply to his indifference to religion altogether.

The sequel to Skeres's reference to the etymological meaning of *Christopher*, "Kit started at hearing his name's true meaning in that mouth" [p.265], is a cause of perplexity. As well as surprise, Marlowe's reaction suggests an unexpected resolution of his doubts

through a flash of insight into the significance of his forename, supplying him with the answer to the question posed in [30]. Precisely what the true meaning of the name is not disclosed, which gives rise to two possible readings of the revelation. The first is that Marlowe has a change of heart: after a lifetime of first scorning and then questioning the faith he was brought up in, he becomes reconciled to it just before he dies. The second is simply the sudden realisation that his doubts are about to be resolved: within a few moments he will be dead, and therefore able to find out whether the orthodox account of Christ is true or not.

10.2.3.1. *The Conversion Hypothesis*

The idea that Marlowe undergoes a last-minute conversion is supported by the resonances of the Passion in the ensuing account of his murder [pp.266-7]. Skeres, after changing places with Frizer, and Poley are depicted as seated on either side of him to prevent his escape as Frizer drives the dagger into Marlowe's eye. Marlowe is therefore killed between a hired assassin and an agent provocateur, just as Christ is reported to have been crucified between two malefactors (Matthew 27: 44; Mark 15: 27-8; Luke 23: 39-43). The manner of Marlowe's death also bears similarities with the crucifixion. The playwright is killed by being stabbed in the eye while Christ is run through the side by a lance, although he has already expired when this is done to him.

To these correspondences a further three may be added. The first is the explicit likening of the supper party prior to the murder to the Last Supper. Poley muses on the associations evoked by the term *supper*, remarking that it "is a word of strange finality" [p.265], an impression which possibly "derives from the scriptures." Marlowe's deliberating on his future in the garden at Widow Bull's is likewise reminiscent of the Agony in the Garden, although reversing the order in which they occur in relation to the account given in the Gospels. Whereas Marlowe's soul-searching takes before the supper party, the Agony of the Garden occurs after the Last Supper. Central to Christ's passion is the figure of Judas, the apostle that betrays him to his enemies. In the case of Marlowe's martyrdom this role is assumed by his former lover, Thomas Walsingham. Not only is the Deptford meeting arranged in his house, most probably with his full knowledge, Walsingham forsakes Marlowe precisely when he is in most need of his patron's protection. As a consequence of the analogies drawn between the Deptford killing and the Passion, Marlowe emerges as a Christ-like figure that is betrayed, scorned and finally put to death.

The hypothesis of a last-minute conversion, suggested by the Biblical echoes of the passage, would argue for the existence of an objective standard of correctness for names. Marlowe's reconciliation with Christianity would signify he has finally started in death to live up to the moral expectations of the name he bears. In this respect *Christopher* would be an inductive name, defined in 2.1.4 as a name describing a quality that, it is hoped, will eventually rub off on its bearer.

10.2.3.2. *The Hypothesis of an Imminent Resolution*

The hypothesis of a deathbed repentance is seriously weakened by an apparent token of Marlowe's atheism. Just before their supper is served Poley tests his reliability by asking him three questions, which Marlowe answers in the negative:

> —Is the Queen a virgin?
> —No.
> —Is God in his heaven?
> —No.
> —Have you ever bedded a woman?
> —No [p.264].

The second question seems to ask after Marlowe's religious orthodoxy, as it appears to bear on the belief in the existence of God. The negative answer is accordingly interpreted as an assertion of his disbelief, and as a result a confirmation of his much-bruited atheism.

In this light the replacement of *bearer* with *carrier* may be regarded as the result of a conscious choice. Marlowe's answer to the question convinces Skeres that Marlowe is an atheist rather than an agnostic, prompting him to opt for the noun which does not carry connotations of Christian fortitude. However, *carry* has other meanings than 'support' or 'transport.' The verb combines with nouns signifying purport such as *meaning* and *implication* so that the resulting collocations, *carry meaning* and *carry implications*, may be simplified as *mean* and *imply* respectively. The collocations would necessarily involve interpreting *Christ* as a denotatum rather than a citation form. Skeres's rendering of *Christopher* can consequently be paraphrased as 'the one that means or implies "Christ".'

The corollary of the paraphrase of *the carrier of Christ* is that this rendering of the etymological meaning of *Christopher* describes the name itself rather than its bearer. It is *Christopher*, and not Marlowe, that signifies 'Christ,' because signification is the property of linguistic expressions, not the entities they refer to. The problem with this

rendering is that it effectively impedes any resolution of the question concerning the appropriacy of *Christopher*. The descriptive content of the name is itself used as a name, and therefore requires ascertaining its appropriacy with regard to its bearer. But determining whether *Christ* is a fitting title for Jesus of Nazareth lies beyond human reason, because there is no way of discovering the truth of his divine nature other than taking it on trust.

The imminence of Marlowe's death means that the resolution of his quandary is at hand. If Christ is indeed the Son of God, *Christopher* will have been an inappropriate name for Marlowe. If, by contrast, Christ is not the Son of God, the entire question of appropriacy will fall into abeyance: *Christopher* is merely an expression for the primary identification of its bearer, as serviceable for this purpose as any other expression.

10.3. Agnostic Renderings of *Christopher*

Marlowe's own reflections on the import of *Christopher* in [30] are briefly commented on in the introduction to Chapter Three in relation to the ambiguity of *Christ* in "I bear Christ on my back." This ambiguity is traceable to the polysemy of *bear*. The phrasing of the sentence gives to understand that the verb is used with the meaning 'carry' or 'support' on the one hand, and on the other 'endure' or 'suffer' to the degree that *bear* implies an onerous load. Given the onomastic context of Marlowe's utterance, however, the collocation *bear Christ* may also be read as 'be called Christ' because the verb frequently governs *name*, as well as any linguistic expression that counts as a name such as *Christ*. Marlowe in effect is comparing himself with his namesake, only that the burden he is encumbered with is not so much Christ as *Christ*, together with the all the significance that is attached to the title.

The agnosticism conveyed through Marlowe's rendering of his forename is not just religious scepticism. The ambiguity as to whether *Christ* is used to refer to Jesus of Nazareth or mentioned as a constituent element of *Christopher* places the issue of Christ's nature within the context of the search for Marlowe's identity. Marlowe's concern with Christ is to large extent traceable to the fatefulness of his forename considered as an inductive name. The etymological meaning of *Christopher* places a heavy burden on him on account of the discrepancy between the actual personality of its bearer and that suggested by the name. Nevertheless, as Marlowe's question implies, the relation between onomastic appropriacy and etymology requires that, in his case, the meaning of *Christ* must be established so that *Christopher* can be pronounced to be

appropriate or not. The impossibility of ascertaining whether or not Christ is indeed the Messiah entails the impossibility of confirming the appropriacy of *Christopher*. Marlowe's agnosticism, then, is linguistic as well as religious. Ironically, his scepticism results in a more profound and agonising engagement with the figure of Christ than that of a devout Christian, an engagement which touches on issues apparently as disparate as Marlowe's mindset, sexual identity and morality.

10.3.1. Agnosticism and Dogmatism

Because of his religious scepticism, Marlowe is labelled an atheist. In the present-day meaning of the term atheism is the outright denial of the existence of God, and by extension the negation that Jesus Christ is God incarnate. Despite his grave doubts on the Christian religion, Marlowe never goes so far as to aver that God does not exist, and that Christ is not the incarnation of the Godhead. Indeed, at one point he writes off atheism as a logical absurdity:

> The truth is that there are no atheists, since who would be so witless as to assert what he cannot prove? Simply and in all candour we must shrug and say we know nothing [p.161].

In other words, the existence of God can neither be proved nor disproved, and for this reason it is as fruitless to argue that God does not exist as to argue otherwise. Marlowe's stand is therefore agnostic rather than atheist: he does not deny the existence of God; he merely confesses his incapability to discover whether He exists or not.

Marlowe's agnosticism is a product of his rationalism. The question of God's existence is one that cannot be settled by arguing from first principles, and it is the rationalist basis of his agnosticism which opposes Marlowe to Christianity. Whatever the denomination, Christianity calls on the worshipper to accept its tenets as absolutes revealed to humanity by God himself. From the rationalist point of view the recourse to divine revelation is little more than a convenient *deus ex machina* to preclude any critical examination of the assumptions the Christian faith is grounded on. The truth is not given but established after a process of verification, and therefore nothing ought ever to be taken on trust, even the alleged Word of God. The Christian appeal to faith might be defined as dogmatic. On the one hand it seeks to persuade worshippers to believe that Christian doctrine is made up of truths which are both self-evident and irrefutable, and on the other to dissuade them from considering evidence or opinions which contradict those truths.

The dogmatism of the Christian religion not only entails its being rigidly categorical in its beliefs and values. It also involves coercion with a view to ensuring the absolute obedience of those who profess the faith, and intolerance towards other faiths or denominations. Both Catholicism and Protestantism demand from its worshippers complete conformity to their respective interpretations of Christianity under pain of excommunication and death. Each anathematises the other as a foul heresy based on an interpretation of the Christian faith which is not only erroneous but also wicked, writing off the worshippers of the rival creeds as lost souls destined for damnation. Their common dogmatism belies the supposedly irreconcilable differences that separate the staunch Protestant from the devout Roman Catholic. Each holds their Church to be in possession of the truth, and each has a Manichaean view of the world in which they are in the right and other in the wrong.

Given the claim to absolute validity by the contending creeds, Marlowe's agnosticism exposes him to the disapproval of Catholic and Protestant alike. His probing into the question leads him to consider two possibilities concerning the nature of Christ apart from the orthodox view that He is the Son of God:

> But Christ was but a mortal man. Or Christ never was [p.186].

Not to accept *a priori* the divinity or existence of Christ is not necessarily to deny that he exists and is divine, but to entertain these two options is by itself sufficient cause to be accused of heresy if not downright atheism. To admit ignorance of whether Christ is God made man is likewise impious because the admission implies that the account of Christ given in the New Testament is not incontrovertible, as the theologians would have everyone believe. Atheist or agnostic, Marlowe goes against the teachings of the Church, Catholic as well as Protestant.

Marlowe's religious doubts foster a linguistic pessimism regarding the appropriacy of his forename. If Christ is indeed the Messiah, then *Christopher* is an inappropriate name for one of so little faith. If, by contrast, Christ was merely a man or never existed, the forename is neither appropriate nor inappropriate because *Christ* becomes devoid of all meaning except, in the event he did exist, as a title arrogated by a claimant to the Jewish throne. However, as the divinity of Christ can never be established other than by resorting to *credo*, the appropriacy or inappropriacy of *Christopher* can never be established either. Either way the name places a heavy burden on its bearer. If the orthodox account of Christ is true, Marlowe is unworthy of his forename, earning him

the obloquy consequent on his unworthiness. On the other hand, if the account is not true, he is bereft of a stable identity.

10.3.2. Agnosticism and Homosexuality

Marlowe's vexed relationship with received religious beliefs is further complicated by his sexual orientation. One key passage for understanding how his homosexuality alienates him from Christianity has already been examined in 6.3.3, namely the episode in which he, posing as a student seeking answers for his religious doubts, is heard in confession by Ballard. As a Jesuit, the homophobic homily Ballard delivers represents the Catholic point of view on sodomy, but the abhorrence in which he holds this "foul sin" is one that is shared with Protestants. Frizer, an Anglican, resorts to the same arguments against homosexuality as Ballard does, although drawing on a pagan authority to make his point:

> But even in Aristotle (…) it is laid down that love is for engendering.
>
> But it is logic, is it not, that entwining is for engendering
>
> But [sodomy] is against nature [pp.256-7].

The stigmatisation of homosexuality by Catholic and Protestant alike seems to be given a Scriptural basis by the Narrator's appropriation of the Parable of the Sower to describe the orgasm Marlowe experiences on violating him:

> He kept crying God as in some form of repentance but there was nothing to repent except the spending of seed in barren places, the fault, if it be fault, of fortuity, as in Christ's parable of the sower that went forth to sow [p.36].

Apart from aberrant and ungodly, homosexuality is a sterile form of love, not only because no children can ever come from sexual congress between males, but also because no lasting bond can be forged by a relationship that flouts the laws of both nature and God.

The parable relates Marlowe's sexual orientation to the perceived inappropriacy of his forename. In the sequel to the parable, the "stony places" on which the seed falls are glossed as those who initially accept Christ's call but are overcome by the temptations of the world (Matthew 13: 20; Mark 4: 16-7; Luke 8: 13), an explication applicable to Marlowe. His Master's degree destines him for the ministry, a calling he forsakes at the first opportunity for the more disreputable careers of playwright and spy. Further, the homoerotic subtext given to the parable places the onus of Marlowe's repudiation of the

cloth squarely on his concupiscence, particularly his weakness for boys and infatuation for Thomas Walsingham. The ribald early Modern English sense of *spending* as 'ejaculation' (Partridge 1968: 187) brings out the Biblical senses of *seed* of 'semen' and *barren*, which replaces the *stony* of the Gospels, of 'unable to conceive children.' Marlowe's homosexuality is therefore presented as the cause for his decision not to take holy orders, a step which may be viewed as a failure to live up to the expectations raised by his forename. Because it contains the title of the Saviour, *Christopher* comes across as a particularly apposite name for one who is to devote his life to the pulpit. In turning his back on Christ, then, Marlowe also renounces his own name by rendering it a particularly infelicitous one.

10.3.3. Agnosticism and Morality

One thing that transpires from Ballard's proscription of homosexuality, drily echoed by Marlowe in the comment "[t]hose who took their love otherwise must be punished with fire and brimstone" [p.256], is the emphasis on punishing rather than reclaiming the sinner. God consumes Sodom and Gomorrah with fire and brimstone and sends the unrepentant homosexual to hell. The comminatory and punitive character of Christianity sits rather oddly with its claim to be a religion founded on God's infinite love for humanity.

The contradiction is resolved by presenting the punishment God metes out to the sinner as a manifestation of divine love and mercy. This squaring of the circle is not confined to one confession but is common to them all. Thus, the mystical Kett enjoins Marlowe to join him in prayer "for the realm's purgation, lustration, salvation" [p.7]. The enumeration suggests the expiation through physical suffering is an essential prerequisite to the attaining of the state of spiritual purity necessary for salvation. The Catholic lecturer at Rheims expresses the same idea in similar terms: "God may not love sin, though he may love the sinner in the expectation of his becoming cognisant of the sin and ready for lustration and repentance" [p.52]. The latter goes further and includes damnation as a manifestation of God's love: "For damnation and salvation alike are the signs of God's holy care of his highest creation." From this it follows that the infliction of suffering is a mark of divine favour, and the greater the suffering inflicted, the greater the favour shown.

Chastisement, making sinners suffer for their own good, is resorted to by both the secular and ecclesiastical authorities to show their religious zeal. The powers that be

emulate God not only by exacting the love and absolute obedience of their subjects, but also by putting heretic and schismatic alike to the torture and death. The persecutions and executions carried out in God's name is an unpalatable but obtrusive facet of institutional religion which weighs heavily on Marlowe's mind:

> Blessed tree and blessed birds, that were to be neither saved nor damned. Blessedly the birds flew over the screams of the charred heretics or the traitors who saw briefly and in disbelief their intestines cast in boiling water [pp.52-3].

Particularly oppressive is the knowledge that the gallows and the stake are the favoured instruments for the building of the Kingdom of Heaven, regardless of confession. Marlowe witnesses at first hand, and is responsible for, the savage execution of Ballard and his associates by order of the Queen, the head of the Church of England. He is keenly alive to the equally savage burnings of Protestants in the reign of Catholic Queen Mary, carried out before his time but very much present in the collective unconscious of Elizabethan England. And John Penry's remark that "[we] will think of burning others when we ourselves have gone through the fire" [p.185] leaves little doubt that the Puritans, now a persecuted minority, are not averse to killing their religious adversaries. Catholic, Anglican and Puritan are all alike in their apeing of the punitory and inflexible nature of God.

The atrocities perpetrated in the name of religion causes Marlowe to harbour grave doubts as to the claim that Christianity is a religion founded on God's love for his creation. At Rheims he imagines himself taking issue with God on this score, "[y]ou condone too many murders in your name" [p.47], an objection expressed more forcefully after witnessing the extreme cruelty shown at the execution of the Babington plotters:

> God grins at all this, but mayhap there is no God, a true God would not stomach it, Christ in heaven if there be a heaven and Christ be in it must look down and cry drag them to hell if there be a hell [p.94].

In addition to giving vent to the horror and disgust aroused by the public spectacle of hanging, drawing and quartering, Marlowe's outburst echoes what is known as the Epicurean paradox, a *reductio ad absurdum* of the idea of an all-powerful and benevolent god in a world where there is suffering and evil. If God is benevolent but evil exists, he cannot be omnipotent because his benevolence would move him to abolish evil if he was. Conversely, if he is omnipotent and evil exists, he cannot be benevolent because he would not permit evil if he was. The impossibility of squaring benevolence and omnipotence with evil opens the door to atheism: the merciful but just

God of the Scripture is merely a fiction created to lend legitimacy to the powers that be. None of the three conclusions reflects positively on the Christian religion. The first entails that Christianity is based on a lie because it worships a vengeful and bloodthirsty God, and not the merciful and loving being that he is made out to be. The second presupposes that Christianity is founded on hypocrisy in that religious worship would merely consist in paying lip-service to a benevolent but ineffectual God who can safely be ignored. The third would entail that Christianity is a sham made up of hollow ritual and bogus teachings. Which of the three prospects listed is the true one is not known, but each of them constitutes a good reason for rejecting God, which is the conclusion Marlowe reaches: "God (…) and his angels and saints are fit only for oaths."

Together with his rationalism and homosexuality, Marlowe's outraged humanity leads him to disown Christianity as a religion fit for fools, hypocrites and sadists. In doing so, he turns his back on his forename because it contains the title of the God in whose name believers are prepared to kill and be killed. Ironically, the repugnance Marlowe feels for the excesses committed in the name of religion makes him more of a Christian than many who firmly believe in God. The compassion he has on those who fall victim to sectarianism strongly resembles the charity and forbearance towards others that in the Gospels Christ enjoins his followers to practice. In this respect *Christopher* is an appropriate name. Although not acknowledging it, Marlowe adheres to Christ's injunction and suffers grievously for it.

10.3.4. Political Agnosticism

In his more serene moments Marlowe takes a detached view of the contradictions of institutional Christianity, particularly with regard to its relation with power. The inconsistency between the forbearance and self-abnegation preached by the Christian faith and the actual conduct of Christians who profess these values is grounds for seriously doubting the sincerity of their profession of their religion. The higher one goes up the social scale, the more blatant this inconsistency is, and the graver the doubts raised over the sincerity of the religious sentiment professed are. The realities of public life are such that they preclude any possibility of a genuine trade-off between political expediency and the other-worldly values of piety and humility. The appeal made by both prince and prelate to religion to sanction actions judged as reprehensible by Christian standards leads Marlowe to adopt a position describable as Machiavellian with regard to the role of religion in the cut-throat world of politics.

What is meant by Machiavellism is an absolute disbelief in the good faith of the powerful in questions of religion (Hunter 1985: 141). The ruling elite set little or no store by religion, though they are interested in inculcating religious belief in those subject to their authority as a means of maintaining their privileged position. Marlowe's Machiavellism is neatly condensed in his brief exposé of how God is used to rubber-stamp the measures implemented by the ruling classes:

> Our rulers decide, then call on God to justify. So God is dragged into presiding over the state's enactments, and God's eternal foe is conjured up to inspire warlocks and witches, Jews and Jesuits and others of the heretical brood [pp.138-9].

His exposure of the ratifying role given to religion in statecraft turns on its head early Modern political theory. The authority invested in the both the temporal and spiritual ruler is of divine provenance and are responsible only to God for their actions so that, as agents of the divine will, they are owed the same obedience that is due to God. The claim that the ruler's authority comes from God is a ploy to pre-empt dissension. If his subjects can be induced to believe that to criticise the actions of the state is to go against God, then it far easier to command their allegiance. In the event the ruse does not work, the folk devils Marlowe enumerates are brought in. Anyone that dares to dissent can be denounced as being aligned with the God's adversary and working for the overthrow of the divine order of the created universe by throwing into chaos the polity, the social parallel of the divinely ordered cosmos. God is not the guiding influence over the affairs of state he is made out to be, but a pretext for action taken to further the interests of the ruling clique.

The manipulation of religious sentiment for worldly ends does not necessarily invalidate religion. The validity —or invalidity— of the precepts of the Christian faith is unaffected by the unhallowed uses they are put to, as is the truth as to whether God exists or not. However, the suspicion that the ruling classes have a vested interest in religion has a debilitating effect on the recusant's own faith. That the cynicism of those charged to uphold the faith does not bring down divine judgment may result in rational-minded dissenters like Marlowe wondering whether there is a God after all. Either they are forced to concur with the cynics and become an atheist like them, or they are forced to the conclusion that, if he exists, God is an ineffectual deity. Since the question cannot be settled through rational inquiry, the dissenter must beat a retreat to an unsatisfactory agnosticism.

10.3.5. Onomastic Arbitrariness

Marlowe's forename does not sit well with him because he does not fulfil the Christian values enshrined in it. His doubts concerning the veracity of the divine nature of Christ renders *Christopher* unsuitable because it conveys the idea of being steadfast in the faith. The imputation of imposture he makes against the ruling elite likewise makes him unworthy of his name, partly because it shows irreverence and lack of charity, defects held to be unbecoming in a Christian, but mainly because the charge of closet atheism in others may be interpreted as a projection of his own atheism. Above all, Marlowe's homosexuality is what sunders him from his forename because it constitutes a double violation of Christian sexual morality: because it is sex for the gratification of one's lusts instead of procreation, and because it is unnatural. The generalised preference for *Kit* over *Christopher* is a tacit acknowledgement of the perceived inappropriacy of the forename and the appropriacy of the familiar name.

The supplanting of *Christopher* by *Kit* realises the intuition expressed in Juliet's soliloquy of the dissociation of *rose* from its referent, discussed in 2.1.1, and the subsequent replacement of the term for another. The difference between the hypothetical and the actual operation is the underlying assumption of each. Whereas Juliet takes for granted the arbitrariness of the association between the word and its referent, Marlowe's acquaintances presuppose a standard of correctness for the assignation of a name to its nominatum. In the latter case, the appropriacy or inappropriacy of a name is based on an etymological understanding of correctness. The etymologising of *Christopher* reveals it to be an unsuitable name for Marlowe because he cannot be considered as a true bearer of Christ according to the orthodox reading of the phrase. The relation of onomastic correctness with etymology is reminiscent of the etymological section of the *Cratylus*, which has been interpreted as both a rational reconstruction and dismantling of the naturalist position on the correctness of names (Barney 2001: 52). As with Juliet's rose, the exploration of issues raised by the appropriacy of *Christopher* compels what might be termed onomastic arbitrariness after showing up the deficiencies of etymology as a key to the appropriacy or inappropriacy of names.

10.3.5.1. *Etymology and Onomastic Appropriacy*

A considerable portion of the *Cratylus* is taken up with Socrates etymologising a selection of terms from the lexicon of ancient Greek philosophy, religion, ethics and

science (Reeve 1999 [1998]: xxix; Barney 2001: 49). Ostensibly, the purpose of this etymological *tour de force* is to illustrate the contribution of etymology to the specification of what the natural correctness of linguistic expressions consists in. Just as the discipline is understood today, ancient Greek etymology seeks to reconstruct the derivation of a term from a pre-existing one by tracing the former back to the latter, as *Christopher* can be traced back, via Latin *Christophorus*, to Greek *Khristophoros*. Unlike present-day etymologists, however, the ancient Greeks assume that the reflex preserves intact the meaning of its etymon, or primary name, an assumption which Barney (2001: 55) terms "strong etymology." Accordingly, *Christopher* means 'Christ-bearer' insofar as the phrase is a loan translation of its Greek etymon. The ancient Greek etymologists also assume that a primary name does not merely refer to the entity it denotes but that it reveals and expresses the nature of that entity. Since a derived name conserves the meaning of the primary one, it will be appropriate if the nominatum of the former resembles that of the latter. On this account, *Khristophoros* is revelatory of the saint who bore Christ across the raging torrent, while *Christopher* belies the vicious nature of a dissolute playwright. A strong etymology, then, is founded on the assumption that, to be appropriate, a name should provide insight into the nature of its nominatum.

The strong etymology of *Christopher* nevertheless begs a number of awkward questions. The religious symbolism of the name would suggest that its primary name is *Khristophoros*, but as a compound it is analysable into *Khristo-* and *-phoros*. Of the two elements that make up the name the onomastic suffix is the one that properly identifies the bearer of *Christopher*, indicating that he is 'the one that bears.' The base the suffix is attached to is also a term endowed with onomastic status, as *Khristos* is used for the primary identification of Jesus of Nazareth. Since the etymology of *Christopher* leads to another name, the etymology of *Khristos* needs to be undertaken as well, in order to establish the significance of the compound it forms part of. If the second etymology is not undertaken, one is left with the uninformative gloss 'the one that bears the one that bears *Khristos*,' which is the thrust of Marlowe's question in [30]. The *reductio ad absurdum* of the etymologising of *Christopher* throws into relief one of the pitfalls entailed in the view that the correct meaning of a name is the meaning of the primary name it is derived from, namely that it results in an infinite regress of etymologies. Strictly applied, the strong etymology of Marlowe's forename is useless as a tool to

discover its correct meaning because of the impossibility of recovering its primal etymon.

The alternative to the interminable regression of etymologies is to assume *Khristos* to be the unetymologisable root of *Christopher*. This rests on the assumption that the title is revelatory of the nature of its holder: *khristos* is the translation of Hebrew *mãshïah*, meaning 'anointed,' and thereby identifying Jesus of Nazareth one on whom a divine office is conferred. However, apart from undermining the role of etymology in establishing the correctness of the name, the expedient ultimately resorts to an act of faith, the acceptance on no evidence that Christ is indeed the Messiah sent by God to redeem humanity from their fallen state. As it is reduced to a question of faith, the correctness of *Christopher* can never be demonstrated, an impasse reminiscent of the arbitrariness of the association of *rose* with its referent. Whatever solution is adopted, strong etymology is unable to discover the correct meaning of the name: either because the etymology cannot be completed, or because when the primary name is reached its meaning is established by convention. For this reason Crystal (1988: 42-3; 1991 [1980]: 126) refers to the recourse to strong etymology to determine the "correct" meaning of a word as the etymological fallacy.

10.3.5.2. *The Dissociation of the Name from the Named*

Linguistic arbitrariness adds another complication not only to the etymological position on onomastic correctness but also the notion of correctness itself. As Juliet's rose demonstrates with nouns, the arbitrariness principle highlights the fact that a name and its nominatum are separate entities, the one a linguistic entity and the other a physical or notional one. The separateness of name and nominatum is explicitly referred to in the reply to Marlowe's reproof of God's apparent consent to the cruelty inflicted for his sake, as well as the consequences of the consequences of their separateness:

> You condone too many murders in your name. *I condone nothing. I am above such things. My name is not myself. When men use my name they do not know me*[1] [p.47].

Knowing someone's name does not necessarily mean knowing who they are, and the image of the bearer conjured up by the name may not necessarily correspond to his or her true identity. In the case of Christ, the different avatars he is presented as impedes discovery of his true nature, and by extension the attaching of meaning to his name. The image of him as the Good Shepherd who protects his flock and recovers his erring sheep

[1] In italic script in the original.

and that of him as the Man of Sorrows who tamely submits to his destiny cancel each other out, and the image of him as the stern judge who decides who is to be saved and who to be damned squares with neither of the other two. Establishing the true identity of Christ appears to be as impossible as discovering the correct meaning of *Christ*.

The separate existence of the name and its bearer carries further implications, contained in the second of the two alternatives Marlowe opposes to the orthodox view of Christ: "But Christ was but a mortal man. Or Christ never was" [p.186]. The title *Christ* can exist and be used, even though it has a non-existent nominatum. Yet the existence of *Christ* as a linguistic entity would confer a spurious existence on its imaginary nominatum by allowing it to be spoken about. The epistemological repercussions of this are, as Socrates' etymological display in the *Cratylus* indicate, considerable. Language is revealed to be a highly deceptive medium because, in giving a linguistic existence to otherwise non-existent entities, it induces its users to acquire a false image of the world.

Since the appropriacy of *Christopher* makes sense only if what the Gospels relate of Christ is true, the confirmation that he did not in fact exist will result in the name losing all the significance accorded to it because the criterion which establishes the appropriacy of naming somebody *Christopher* turns out to have no objective basis. But as Christ's divine nature is a matter of faith rather than reason, the question cannot be definitively resolved in one way or the other. Consequently, the idea that there is an absolute standard of correctness for naming stems from conviction rather than ontological evidence. One may contend that a name should reflect the qualities of its bearer, or that the name carries the impress of the bearer's personality; but neither contention can prevail over the other. *Christopher* is a point where theological intersects with onomastic inquiry, yielding the same result: the one leading to religious agnosticism, the other to linguistic agnosticism.

10.4. Uses of *Christopher*

The perceived inappropriacy of *Christopher* has meant that the name is used by itself only twelve times in the entire book. There are four token appearances of the name in instances of direct speech reporting utterances made by Marlowe himself, three of them instances of didactic naming. A further four mentions occur in direct speech reporting utterances by Nicholas Skeres, one in an instance of direct speech reporting an utterance by Thomas Nashe and another in an utterance by Father Ballard, and twice in the

narrative. In addition, *Christopher* occurs together with the family name almost as many times as the forename on its own, although the full name is, with the exception of [30], restricted to official documents inserted in the narrative. In this section, therefore, only two excerpts will come under consideration, namely

34. You are gloomy, Kit. Drink, Christopher [p.253]
35. You are with friends, Mr Christopher, Skeres said [p.255].

The name phrases in each excerpt may be considered as constituting a minimal pair in which *Mr Christopher* would be the marked member and *Christopher* the unmarked one. The markedness of the former is due the eccentricity of the modification of the forename by the universal politeness marker, since *Mr* modifies either the full name or the family name, but hardly ever a forename, in the honorific system of both early Modern and Present-Day English (Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg 1995: 555). The oddity of *Mr Christopher* resides in the incongruity between the distance maintained by *Mr* and the closeness conveyed by *Christopher*, with the result that the familiarity of the latter and the formality of the former cancel each other out. Accordingly, the name phrase implies that Nicholas Skeres, the namer in [35], neither enjoys intimacy with Marlowe nor shows him deference, in contrast to Thomas Nashe, the namer in [34], whose use of *Christopher* strongly suggests the existence of a close tie between them. To work out what the implications of *Mr Christopher* are, it is necessary first to examine those of *Christopher*, which correspond to common naming practices.

10.4.1. The Sympathetic Attitude towards Marlowe

What merits comment about the naming practices in [34] is that they invert the general tendency displayed in the naming conventions applied to Marlowe. As already indicated and illustrated, the norm is to substitute *Kit* for *Christopher* soon after the introductions have been made, whereas Nashe addresses him first by his familiar name and then his forename. The reversal of the normal pattern implies that *Kit* is the usual term of address that Nashe uses, an implication corroborated by the other use he makes of the name to refer to Marlowe: “He gets at Kit another way” [p.225]. The relevance of the inversion is faintly suggested by the phonological and syntactic patterning the names are subjected to, as both cases of vocative address occur at the end of their respective sentences, and the name phrases are linked together by alliteration. To understand in what way the transposition of *Kit* and *Christopher* is relevant, the context in which the utterance occurs needs to be considered.

Nashe's observation of Marlowe's despondency comes shortly after the latter's remark on the avoidance of his forename made in [30]. In this light the switch from *Kit* to *Christopher* may regarded as an attempt to humour Marlowe by calling him by the name his other acquaintances ignore. However, Nashe may also be prompted by the intuition that he is seeing his friend for the last time insofar as the atmosphere that pervades their meeting is that of the melancholy that comes from a final separation. Marlowe has just broken with Walsingham and asked Nashe to put him up for the night before he proceeds to Deptford the following morning. The talk turns on deceased former acquaintances, which leads to the imminence of Marlowe's own death or his exile. Nashe's invitation to wine, moreover, echoes Ballard's [32], "[w]ell, Christopher, drink," a toast to the priest's death proposed by the unwitting victim. The evocation of the drinking party at Rheims lends an ominous air to the utterance so that it can be read as a farewell toast to a man that is going to his death.

Calling Marlowe by his birth name may be regarded as the act of a friend, even if it is done to indulge in a whim. Nashe is well aware of Marlowe's unsavoury reputation, as well as the widespread perception of the inappropriacy of his name because of it. Nevertheless, he addresses Marlowe as *Christopher* to let him know that he sets no store by the malicious aspersions cast on him.

10.4.2. Hostility against Marlowe

As in Nashe's lugubrious toast, Skeres's ambivalent *Mr Christopher* originates from a reversal of the *Christopher-Kit* pattern that characterises the naming of Marlowe. Shortly after the latter's arrival at Widow Bull's, Skeres affects a let-bygones-be-bygones spirit:

> —Friends, friends, again and again friends, Skeres said. May we thou and thee? May you be called Kit?
> —Christopher.
> —Formal, aye, but a holy name [p.254].

Skeres's conduct regarding Marlowe has habitually been supercilious, and his insincere overture to friendship is another manifestation of his insolence: hence Marlowe's insistence on keeping distances by letting Skeres know that he should address him by his forename. The correction is an instance of what Goffman (1956: 489) terms demeanour, that is, behaviour exhibited to create the impression that self possesses socially approved qualities which make him or her deserving of other's regard. Since face can only be given by other (Holtgraves 2005: 74), demeanour is a means of

inducing other to maintain self's face. More than a rebuff, then, Marlowe's express desire to be addressed by his forename indicates that he has seen through Skeres's show of good-fellowship, and that he wishes not to be taken as fool enough to have fallen for it.

Far from abating Skeres's insolence, however, the slight gives him occasion to play on Marlowe's susceptibility. The affixing of *Mr* to *Christopher* not only apes but also surpasses Marlowe's demand that he be addressed as *Christopher*. If he seeks to distance Skeres by having him call him by his forename instead of *Kit*, Skeres places himself at an even further remove by virtue of his use of the status marker. The ostentatious compliance to the request to maintain social distance in reality entails disregarding it. The exchange of over-politeness for over-familiarity makes a mockery of the requirement in both senses of the term: Skeres mocks Marlowe by imitating his distancing himself from him; and in imitating him, he mocks Marlowe by expressing his contempt for him. Each address as *Mr Christopher* is an insult.

To a large extent Skeres's impertinence hinges on the supposed inappropriacy of *Christopher*. His response to Marlowe's demand is to affect brief demurral, "[f]ormal, aye," followed by his ostensible acquiescence to the requirement on the strength of the sacred nature of the playwright's preferred term of address, "but a holy name." The description of *Christopher* as "holy" is a broad allusion to its etymological meaning. Holiness is supposed to inspire reverence and awe, feelings far removed from the disdain and scorn Skeres harbours for the bearer of the name. In affixing *Mr* to *Christopher*, the name phrase is foregrounded and its misapplication exposed, as Marlowe is felt to deserve of neither reverence nor awe but of contempt. The discrepancy resulting from the collocation of the status marker with the forename reflects the inappropriacy of the association of the name with its bearer.

Once his contempt for Marlowe is expressed, and the inappropriacy of *Christopher* stressed, Skeres sardonically announces he will call him by his familiar name:

> You [i.e. Frizer] are something of a poet. Is he not so, Mr Christopher, oh I will say Kit, we are all friends [p.264].

The return to over-familiarity constitutes a reversion to the *Christopher-Kit* pattern, as well as the definitive loss of Marlowe's birth name. Until the coroner's inquest, which lies outside the narrative proper, the forename is not used again. Realising that Skeres has finally prevailed, Marlowe gives way, even to the extreme of consenting to Frizer addressing him as *Kit*. The final humiliation of losing his name suggests another parallel

with the Passion. Marlowe is divested of his name prior to his murder, just as Christ is stripped of his garments before his crucified, a parallel complemented and reinforced by the echoes of the soldiers casting lots for Christ's coat (Matthew 27: 35; Mark 16: 24; Luke 23: 34; John 19: 23-4) in the round of backgammon Marlowe plays with Skeres [p.263]. His submission to the loss of his name preludes Marlowe's death.

10.5. Recapitulation

The examination of the etymological meaning of Marlowe's forename reveals it to be as intractable to onomastic correctness. Establishing the appropriacy of *Christopher* through its etymology results in either a *mise en abyme* of endless etymologies, or an irresoluble controversy over how the stem of the name is to be understood. In the latter case, an ecumenical approach to the interpretation of *Christ* is ruled out because it would mean admitting that the assumptions the competing interpretations are premised on are neither irrefragable nor irreformable, which in effect entails forgoing the position of the infallible guide in spiritual matters each denomination claims for itself. The only point they are agreed on is the inappropriacy of applying *Christopher* to Marlowe, although the agreement is cancelled out by the absence of a universally accepted criterion of appropriacy for the name.

The intractability of *Christopher* to an absolute standard for onomastic correctness mirrors the mould-breaking character of its bearer with respect to received assumptions on the cosmic and social order. A pervasive feature of the world view that Marlowe questions is what Leech (1981 [1974]: 33) calls "two-valued thinking," or the tendency to dichotomise: God versus Satan, Christianity versus paganism, Protestantism versus Catholicism, and so on. Marlowe's critical stance regarding this Manichaean outlook stems to a large degree from his awareness of the impossibility of being slotted into any of the existing categories. As a homosexual he can be categorised as neither masculine nor feminine, as an agnostic neither an atheist nor a believer, and even as a poet and playwright he perverts the prescribed meanings of language through his art. To the orthodox his ambivalence is even more intolerable than outright opposition to established beliefs. Atheism is in opposition to faith, as are heresy to orthodoxy and feminine to masculine; yet in opposing one another, the terms of each pair underwrite each other as well. Atheism presupposes faith, and heresy orthodoxy, with the result that the atheist and heretic are as much part of the general scheme of things as the believer and the conformist. The agnostic and homosexual, by contrast, disrupts the

entire frame of reference which sanctions the existing order, and as a result is perceived as a far greater threat than the atheist and heretic: hence the urgency, in the words of the Baines note, "to endeavour that the mouth of so dangerous a member [of society as Marlowe] be stopped" (quoted in Steane 1964: 364).

Nevertheless, the inconsistencies in the thesis of the inappropriacy of *Christopher* offer a corrective to the image of Marlowe as a dissolute iconoclast evoked by the various operations of paronomasia on *Kit*. If not denied outright, the figure of "a rebel, an atheist, a fiery soul whose works expressed his own heady exuberance and despairs" (Steane 1969: 9) is considerably toned down and balanced out with that of "a serious, thoughtful man, a scholar, and a writer deeply concerned with suffering and evil." Burgess (1970: 88) refers to the discrepancy as "Marlovian inconsistency," definable as an inability to believe coupled with a respect for the mystery surrounding religious faith and outrage when it is not taken seriously enough, and which Marlowe sets forth when he declines the offer made to him by John Lyly and Thomas Nashe to collaborate with them in the writing of a play on behalf of the Church party in the Marprelate controversy:

> —Listen to me, Kit said, and he knew, saying it, that the me to which he referred was one of a parcel of many within, and he felt a manner of despair or at least desperateness in not knowing well which was to speak. It is easier to believe in this Church of King Henry's founding than not to. I believe, I believe, your worships, and the question of belief never arises. So, with this thin surcoat of belief, we may do our work and drink our drink and never be molested. To question faith is a grave matter, and here you are bringing your clowns in. An atheist at least has set working the engines of thought, and it is no easy matter to throw God out of heaven. The truth is that there are no atheists, since who would be so witless as to assert what he cannot prove? Simply and in all candour we must shrug and say we know nothing [p.161].

Marlowe's, then, is a split personality: that of the visceral, self-assertive tavern orator who delights in rubbishing received beliefs in contrast to the ironic yet sensitive intellectual who examines those beliefs with as open a mind as possible. The personality that emerges is no less subversive than the persona of Marlowe the drunken atheist and trouble-maker —if anything it is *more* subversive— but endowed with a robust and subtle mind together with a keen poetic sensibility.

The complexity of Marlowe's character bulks large in the prologue to *A Dead Man in Deptford*. Having introduced the object of his memoir, the Narrator expresses his doubts as to whether "a life so various, tortured and contradictory" [p.3] is at all amenable to being set down in neat, coherent narrative. The pattern which emerges from

the memoir is that of “the two Marlowes” adumbrated in the passage quoted in the preceding paragraph.

11. Name Density and the Singularisation of *Marlowe*

The sequel to Thomas Walsingham's greeting on seeking Marlowe out at Rheims,

> —Come then, Kit Kit Kit, you see I have remembered the name. My grave cousin was mumbling of Morley and Marley and Merlin, but Tom Watson said Kit was enough [p.48],

aptly sums up the naming of the main character of *A Dead Man in Deptford*: the predominance of the familiar name, the avoidance of the forename, and the mutability of the family name. It also explains why *Kit* should prevail over the variants of *Marlowe* as well as *Christopher*, avoided because of its perceived inappropriacy as a name for an unchristian reprobate. By "Kit was enough" Walsingham means that Marlowe should simply be called *Kit*, but his clarification can also mean that it is simpler to call him so. Whereas the familiar name facilitates the identification of the bearer, the choice of *Morley*, *Marley* and *Merlin* complicates it, as evidenced by Walsingham's amused report of his cousin trying to remember Marlowe's name. By simply calling their man *Kit*, Marlowe's masters in the Service can sidestep the confusion arising from the variety of forms his family name takes, making it easier for them to keep track of their dubious agent.

Name density, Morgan et al.'s term for the many-to-one relation between name and named (see 2.1.3), is the most obtrusive of the three features identified above. Although in Marlowe's case the definition is best emended to a many-to-one relation between name-variant and named, *Marlowe*, *Morley*, *Marley* and *Merlin* are likely to be taken as separate names identifying different individuals rather than variants of a single name identifying the same individual. Francis Walsingham's "mumbling Morley and Marley and Merlin" expresses the view that these variants are different names, and that only one of them is indeed Marlowe's family name, corroborated by their appearance as separate entries in Reaney and Wilson (1997 [1958]: 299, 306 & 314). On the other hand, the excerpt

> —Listen to me, Kit said, and he knew, saying it, that the me to which he referred was one of a parcel of many within, and he felt a manner of despair or at least desperateness in not knowing well which was to speak [p.161].

countenances the impression that Marlowe is "the man with many names," as Downie (2000: 19) calls him. Name density seems to be related to the various selves that inhabit Marlowe, each variant of his family name standing for a different facet of his psyche, although the abundance of names may indicate the absence of a defined inner self (Leal 2004: 13). Alternatively each variant, or name, may be regarded as reflecting the

perception the namer has of Marlowe. Askanas and Kittay (1979: 689-90), reporting Frege (1970: 57-8), equate name density with different modes of presenting the named. *Morley*, *Marley* and *Merlin* all identify Marlowe, but do so in distinct ways so that they may be said to have the same reference but different senses, as they are each embody a different conception of the named. On this account, Francis Walsingham's casting about for the right name may be construed as an inability to make out what kind of person his new agent is.

The Narrator's preference for *Kit* may consequently be read as an attempt to draw together, with the aid of the feline conceit, the numerous strands of "a life so various, tortured and contradictory" to create a unified and coherent picture of Marlowe. Walsingham and his confederates also resort to the familiar name to produce a single, easily intelligible image of Marlowe, but with a view to controlling him, an aim involving the selection and distortion of some aspects of his character while ignoring others. To obtain a more comprehensive portrait of Marlowe, then, it is necessary to go over the variants of his family name and ascertain the role they play in the fictional representation of Christopher Marlowe.

11.1. The Mutability of *Marlowe*: An Overview

The starting point for the present survey will take the selection of excerpts given below, which, save for the last one, all contain didactic naming made by Marlowe himself: the playwright is either telling or reminding his interlocutors what his family name is.

36. —Christopher. The other name is unsure. Marlin, Merlin, Marley, Morley. Marlowe will do [p.9]
37. Master - what is it - Merlin? Marlin?
    —Marlowe will do. Or Marley. Marl is clay and lime, my name's lowly constant [p.13]
38. —The beginning is sure, being Marl or Merl or sometimes Morl, but we are not clear in the family whether it be Marley or Morley or Marlowe. I have in my time been called Merlin, the magician's name. This I write is, I think, Marlowe [p.27]
39. —Marlowe or Marley or Morley. You have a choice [p.32]
40. I am Marlowe or Morley or Marley [p.58]
41. You, what's your name, can be with me. It will be to your credit.
    —Marlowe or Marley
    —Real name?
    —I am what I am what I am what I [p.77]
42. —You are truly Merlin? The Earl smiled.
    —Merlin or Marlin or Marley or Marlowe [p.137]
43. I am happy to see you, Mr Marlin or Morley.
    —Marlowe will do. There be many soundings and spellings [p.197]
44. To lose all that is or was Christopher Marlowe. I have a great name, though not many call me by it [p.252].

The selection is sufficiently broad to draw a number of inferences concerning the array of variant forms. First, despite the invitation for his addressees to take their pick and call him by the variant of their choice, there is a discernible intention on Marlowe's part to induce his new acquaintances to address him as *Marlowe*. To begin with, this variant is not only present in all the extracts cited, it is also given prominence, as either the first variant to be enumerated, as in [39], [40] and [41], or the last, as in [38] and [42]. In [36], [37] and [43] *Marlowe* is isolated from the other variants by being placed in a separate sentence, which in the case of [43] involves occurring in a different utterance altogether. Even the seemingly offhand tag "Marlowe will do," recurring in the manner of a refrain through the self-introductions, is in reality a kind of proviso. And finally, [44], the one occasion the family name is not used for didactic naming, only *Marlowe* is used, suggesting that this variant is considered to be the one of the bearer's choice, despite the freedom he grants his acquaintances to use whichever of the alternates enumerated. Although Marlowe is called by all the variants of the family name, and although he accepts being called by them, it seems that he considers *Marlowe* as the proper form of the name.

The second inference is that, despite Marlowe's apparent preference for this form, *Marlowe* is not without an alternative for the purposes of self-reference. With the exceptions of [43] and [44], *Marley* is not only mentioned in all the excerpts but also tends to be placed in a prominent position, as the first element of the enumeration in [38], or the last in [40]. More significantly, *Marley* is the only variant to co-occur with *Marlowe* in utterances by the bearer in [37] and [41], strongly suggesting that the former variant counteracts the bias in favour of the latter. Support for this suggestion is found in the Narrator's report of Marlowe's asking for the location of his father's new dwelling,

> John Marley or Morley the shoemaker? By there, or near [p.36],

and witnessing the signature of a will,

> that Kit was in Canterbury that November is attested by his name in good black ink in the form Marley. The last will and testament of a certain Mrs Benchkyn bears it as fourth witness. I spoke to one who had seen it, but this is of no moment [p.71].

Its affixation to a legal document confers on *Marley* an official status which *Marlowe* dubiously possesses, as in [38] Marlowe is unable to confirm that *Marlowe* is indeed the signature scrawled on the written oath of allegiance he is swears on entering Francis Walsingham's service. In any case, it is clear that Marlowe's use of the family name is

marked by the hesitation between two variants: *Marley* is reserved for some occasions and *Marlowe* for others, until the latter form is finally adopted. The opposition between the two preferred variants may be attributable to his self-awareness and perception of his desire to shape his own identity. The inner crisis suggested in "the me to which he referred was one of a parcel of many within" points to the existence of conflicting identities resulting from his attempt at what Greenblatt (2005 [1980]: 2) terms self-fashioning. There is one identity Marlowe wishes to give up, embodied in *Marley*, and another he seeks to construct, concretised in *Marlowe*. The familial context in which *Marley* occurs links this variant to Marlowe's background and the hopes and expectations his parents and sisters have placed in him. His preference for *Marlowe* renders it a symbol of his progressive estrangement from his family, poignantly borne on the reader by the sensation of alienation in both the passages dealing with his infrequent visits to Canterbury, an sensation stemming from the awareness that his poetic genius and sexual orientation are at variance with the identity given by his tradesman ancestry and his prospective identity as a clergyman. *Marley* therefore epitomises Marlowe's birth and family heritage against which the emergent identity realised in *Marlowe* defines itself.

A certain degree of prominence is also accorded to *Marlin* and *Merlin*. Their relative salience is most noticeable in [42] on account of the syntactic patterning they undergo, together with the other two candidate variants for the standardised form, *Marley* and *Marlowe*. The former and latter forms are paired off as conjuncts of disjunctive conjoins which are in turn conjuncts of a larger disjunctive conjoin, lending thereby equal validity to each of the four variants for the address or reference to their common bearer. In [38], however, Marlowe affirms that *Merlin* is a term of address received from acquaintances of his, an affirmation which presupposes the existence of another naming convention involving the family name applied exclusively to him. This presupposition is confirmed in Part Two of the novel, in which Marlowe is named *Merlin* with relative frequency, as may be deduced from the following fragments:

45. Our new friend Merlin has pounded London ears with the atheistical ravings of his Tamburlaine [p.137]
46. I would as soon be Merlin as Percy
47. This is Merlin the Marlin that dared God out of heaven [p.146]
48. Skeres greeted him familiarly with *Kit Merlin* [p.175]
49. This is hypocrisy, you know it to be so, Merlin the atheist [p.188]
50. your friend Robin Poley will be steadfast in the old policies and have power enough, and (…) Kit Merlin will do his duty when he can [pp.203-4].

Alongside *Marlowe* and *Marley*, the variants of the bearer's choice, we have *Merlin* and *Marlin*, the variants preferred by some of his acquaintances.

The overview just given of Marlowe's family name gives the impression of divided usage. Marlowe acknowledges the existence of several variants, but uses only two, *Marlowe* and *Marley*, before definitively opting for the former. His choice contrasts with a general preference for *Merlin* and *Marlin* on the part of some of those acquainted with him. As a result, *Marlowe* has to contend not only against *Marley* but also against *Merlin*. However, *Marlowe* receives a big boost from two quarters, enabling it to prevail over the rival variants. The first factor contributing to the ultimate success of *Marlowe* is its consistent use in the historical documents written into the narrative, these being the certificate of good conduct issued by the Privy Council, the warrant for Marlowe's arrest and the inquest findings into the Deptford affray in which he lost his life:

51. Whereas it was reported that Christopher Marlowe (so that is your name) was determined to have gone beyond the seas to Rheims there to remain, their Lordships think it good to certify that he had no such intention and that in all his actions he has behaved he himself orderly and discreetly, whereby he has done Her Majesty good service and deserves to be rewarded for his faithful dealing [p.112]
52. Mr Henry Maunder was directed, in the words of his commission, to repair to the house of Mr Thomas Walsingham or to any other place where he shall understand Christopher Marlowe to be staying and to apprehend him and bring him to court [p.237]
53. in his own defence and for the saving of his life then and there struggled with Christopher Marlowe to get away from his dagger, in which affray Ingram could not get away from Marlowe; and so it befell that in that affray Ingram in defence of his life, with the dagger aforesaid to the value of 12d, gave Christopher a mortal wound over his right eye of which wound Christopher Marlowe then and there instantly died [p.268].

The second factor favouring Marlowe is found in the episode of Thomas Kyd's torture and interrogation at Bridewell, illustrated by the following excerpts:

54. Writ under constraint. Dagger at back. Mr Marlin, Marley, Marlowe. Kyd swooned but was face-flapped back to attention.
    —Marlowe of *Tamburlaine* and *The Jew* [p.234]?
55. This now must be explained. And he gave Kyd a cooling draught from the waved papers marked Vile Heretical Conceits.
    —I have already. Marlowe.
    —Or Marley or Morley or Merlin [p.236]
56. A man of violence, you say, this Marlowe. Also of violent and atheistical speech, as is much reported. His atheism has gone into recent print. Or the imputation thereof. You confirm this from your knowledge [p.237]?

On comparing the three extracts just cited with [36]-[44], it is apparent that not only has the trajectory from a multiplicity of variant forms to *Marlowe* been reproduced, but the bias in favour of this variant has been reinforced as well. Together with the authority of

the documents quoted in [51]-[53], the institutional setting of [54]-[56] confers on *Marlowe* an official status that the other variants lack, ensuring the its survival as the standard form of the family name.

Although cursory, the above survey of the fragments has nevertheless been able to reveal the existence of a drift towards a single form underlying the constant shifts from one variant to another. For this reason the barely perceptible progress towards to what Bakeless (1942: x) terms "the universally accepted form" of Marlowe's family name will from now on be referred to as singularisation. To a large extent, then, *A Dead Man in Deptford* plots the process of singularisation undergone by the family name whereby *Marlowe* prevails over its alternates. This process, however, is hardly meaningful unless another is taken into account as well, which is observable in [45]-[50] and [54]-[56], and which concerns the labelling of Marlowe as an atheist. The notion of singularisation is linked to that of singular name, introduced at the beginning of Chapter Seven, where it was related to the bearer's social maladjustment To relate how *Merlin*, *Marlin*, *Marley* and *Morley* are superseded by *Marlowe* is to relate how their bearer gained an enduring reputation for atheism, and how the singularised variant became a by word for atheism. The selection of *Marlowe* at the expense of the other alternates, then, runs parallel with its transformation into a label, a process that will be termed stigmatisation.

11.2. The Conversion of Names into Labels

Originally, as Goffman (1964: 4) points out, the term *stigma* referred to a distinguishing characteristic collectively interpreted as an index of the bearer's incorrigible infirmity or improbity, deemed so ignominious as to make him or her a social outcast. Three broad types of stigma are identified, namely physical blemishes and deformities, moral shortcomings and erroneous opinions, and different racial, national, political or religious affiliation. In this respect, too, a label may be considered as a symbolic stigma in that it lexicalises a socially disapproved characteristic, or stigma. In a society in which belief in God is not only the norm but also mandatory, such as the late sixteenth-century England depicted in the novel, atheism constitutes a stigma of the second type, inscribed in the semantic content of *atheist* so that the term becomes a label which identifies and marginalises its recipient as one that will not conform to prescribed religious beliefs. To avoid the confusion which may arise from the polysemy of the term, *stigma* will be used with its original meaning of 'undesirable distinguishing feature,' and its acquired, metonymical meaning of 'odium inspired by the possession of an undesirable

distinguishing feature' will be invested in *label* insomuch as the latter term is expressive of the hostility aroused by the stigma denoted by a label. The relation of a label with a stigma is basically a word-referent one: *atheist* is a label that refers to the stigma of holding an unacceptable opinion on religion.

The recovery of the original meaning of *stigma* entails the redefinitions of the derivatives *stigmatise* and *stigmatisation*. As a stigma is to be understood as an undesirable distinguishing feature, and given the word-referent relation between label and stigma, the term *stigmatisation* is applicable to the process whereby a neutral or favourable term is transformed into a label as well as the process whereby prevailing attitudes towards a form of conduct or a manner of thinking change from indifference or approbation to disapproval or repugnance. Consequently, a stigmatised term acts as an imprecative to the extent that it conveys the abhorrence caused by the recipient in the user at the same time it identifies the former in terms of the offending characteristic attributed to him or her. As a consequence of the Reformation, for example, many received views concerning doctrine, liturgy and ecclesiastical organisation were written off as irrelevant, erroneous or downright wicked in the nation states which broke their obedience to Rome, a change of opinion frequently referred to in *A Dead Man in Deptford*. Among militant Protestants *Catholic* undergoes stigmatisation as a result of losing its original meaning of 'universal' and acquiring the negative connotations of superstition, obscurantism and iniquity. Understood as a semantic process, then, stigmatisation is an instance of pejorative change, the process whereby a word comes to express a negative value-judgement on its referent through the limitation of its semantic or descriptive content (Burgess 1975 [1964]: 108).

As shown by the semantic contagion undergone by *Kit*, whereby the name has come to connote waywardness and vulnerability, semantic changes of the type just described also affect personal names, linguistic expressions devoid of denotative meaning. And it is precisely because personal names lack semantic content that it is convenient to restrict *stigmatisation* to pejorative change affecting names only. For instance, in the following exchange between Marlowe and Thomas Kyd,

> But Sir Walter will pay well for your Italian hand.
> —That atheist? [p.194],

the phrases *Sir Walter* and *That atheist* are co-referential, a name and a label. Kyd's echo question expresses the loathing he feels for Raleigh as much as outraged surprise at the idea of working for a man of such ill repute. If the association of *Sir Walter* with

atheist is maintained, however, the semantic content of the label is transferred to the name so that it takes over the former's function of proscribing its bearer. Stigmatisation, the transformation of a name into a label, is therefore a type of epitomisation, the conversion of a core name into a common noun which denotes a salient attribute of the bearer (see 2.2.5.2), but with the peculiarity that the attribute denoted is invariably a negative one. Stigmatised names are the outcome of the obverse process that produces labels. While labelling involves converting a common noun into a non-core name, stigmatisation consists in transforming a personal name into a classifying noun.

The notion of stigma, like that of label, is bound up with the deviance from an assumed norm or ideal so that the three classes of stigma enumerated above presuppose socially accepted standards of appearance, behaviour and attitude. The object of labelling is to identify the recipient as a deviant who does not conform to established norms with a view to his or her expulsion from society. A curious corollary of this is the change of expectations brought about by labelling with regard to the recipient. Once an individual has been identified, denounced and labelled as a deviant, the violated norm is turned on its head, and a new, aberrant set of expectations is applied. In the climate of confessional absolutism reigning in Elizabethan England an atheist is not expected to be chaste, sober and devout, as the general run of his contemporaries are assumed to be, but licentious, intemperate and irreligious. Paradoxically, as Morgan et al. (1979: 47) suggest, labels do not result in the total expulsion of their recipients, but in their slotting in a category that forms a part, albeit a marginal one, of society. Faith is defined by the sceptic rather than the believer, orthodoxy by the heretic rather than the conformist, and loyalty by the traitor than the adherent. The deviant, it seems, is as necessary for social cohesion as the conformist in that the labels the former is given highlight violations of normality, and in doing so provide orientation as to the implicit norms of behaviour underlying life in society (Morgan et al. 1979: 69). For this reason, then, dissidence is produced as well as repressed by the dominant ideology, or, to be more precise, produced to be repressed to consolidate the powers the dominant ideology serves (Dollimore 1991: 26-7).

In [49] *Merlin the atheist* the stigmatisation of the variant family name is made explicit by the epithet appended to it, identifying and denouncing its bearer as one that does not believe in God. The preference for *Merlin* coincides with Marlowe's growing fame as a novel and controversial playwright on the one hand, and his growing notoriety for his atheism and blasphemy on the other. The variant is consequently burdened with

the unfavourable connotations of impiety and irreverence so that it effectively becomes a label that identifies its bearer as an atheist and blasphemer. These connotations are eventually transferred to *Marlowe*, which initially have positive associations when it occurs in official documents. Once the latter form connotes atheism and blasphemy, the variant that originally carried these connotations falls into disuse and disappears, thereby merging the processes of singularisation and stigmatisation. The singularisation of *Marlowe* goes through two stages: a period of co-existence with its stigmatised alternate *Merlin*, followed by its semantic contagion from the latter and its definitive singularisation as a byword for the blaspheming atheist.

11.3. The Stigmatisation of *Merlin*

In [38], after accounting for the vagaries of his family name, Marlowe adds that "I have in my time been called Merlin, the magician's name." The remark not only anticipates the use of *Merlin* for much of the second part of the novel as a serious contender for singularisation, it also highlights his subjection to the naming practice referred to, underscored by the use of the passive voice. Although beyond his control, the gratuitousness with which he mentions the naming convention suggests that Marlowe takes pride in being called *Merlin*. In [42], for instance, Henry Percy's question "[y]ou are truly Merlin?" conveys a measure of awe, implying that it is a privilege to bear such a name. The positive connotations carried by the name variant is, as Marlowe himself points out, due to its identification with the magician of Arthurian legend, considered as a paragon of wisdom and good counsel.

To be called *Merlin*, as the sequel Marlowe's colloquy with the Raleigh set soon shows, proves to be a double-edged privilege. In the tense interview concerning the University's decision not to award Marlowe his MA degree, the habitual rigmarole over his family name is carried out once again:

> —What are you - Merlin or Marley or Morley?
> —Merlin is a magical name. Some call me by it.
> —Well or ill bethought [p.111].

The answer given to the demand that Marlowe should identify himself is more circumspect: the observation "[s]ome call me by it" is calculated to shunt the responsibility for the appellation entirely on to the namer. The retort that follows confirms the good sense of his circumspection by letting on that the magical associations of *Merlin* can be negative as well as positive. Magic can be equated with

sorcery, the possession and application of supernatural powers through commerce with the Devil for the attainment of unhallowed ends. The choice of *Merlin* can consequently express the perception of Marlowe as a threat as well as a person endowed with extraordinary talents.

Within the context of its prevalence in the middle section of the novel, the ambivalence of *Merlin* functions as a criterion to classify its users into two broad groups. The evocation of the positive connotations of the name identifies those who are well-disposed towards Marlowe and employ it as a mark of distinction; the summoning up of the negative associations, by contrast, identifies those who are hostile to him and use the name as a label to denigrate him.

11.3.1. The Ameliorative Use of Merlin

What might be termed the ameliorative use of *Merlin* is limited to the School of Night, the sobriquet for the Raleigh set, notably Walter Raleigh himself and Henry Percy. The positive connotations the name has for them are apparent in the two extracts below, instances of direct speech attributed to Raleigh and Percy respectively:

45. Our new friend Merlin has pounded London ears with the atheistical ravings of his Tamburlaine [p.137]
46. I would as soon be Merlin as Percy.

To begin with, the modification of the name by positively polite *Our new friend* identifies the name phrase as an in-group identity marker, indicating the bearer's admittance into the speaker's social circle. Given the philosophical temper of Raleigh's conclave, *Merlin* is quickly divested of its original magical associations and invested with scientific ones. Even though he is a creator of poetic fictions rather than a philosopher, his sceptical rationalism qualifies him as a member of Raleigh's intellectual circle. On this showing, the bestowal of *Merlin* signals Raleigh and Percy's recognition of Marlowe as one of their own.

Although the name is a bestowal of favour, it is an imposition all the same. After Marlowe's probationary first visit to Durham House, Raleigh sees the visitor off with an enquiry into his identity, "What name do I call you?" [p.131], from which, on the tenor of Marlowe's self-introductions, the reader infers that he reels off his the variants of his family name. This would imply that the introduction "[o]ur new friend Merlin" overrides the bearer's preference for *Marlowe*, rendering the use of *Merlin* as much an instance of performative as didactic naming. As well as introducing the entrant to the

long-standing members of his circle, Raleigh imposes a name on him as part of an informal initiation ceremony to mark the neophyte's induction into the group and the assumption of the identity he is to have within it. On entering the Raleigh set, Marlowe becomes in effect a new person so that he is required to take on a new name to indicate his new identity (Seeman 1980: 129). The choice of *Merlin* at the expense of *Marlowe* is also indicative of Raleigh's ascendancy in the circle, and Marlowe's acquiescence a sign of his acknowledgement of the former's influence.

11.3.2. The Pejorative Use of Merlin

In comparison to the close-knit fellowship of Raleigh's intellectual circle, the users who refer to Marlowe as *Merlin* to vilify him constitute a less homogeneous group. Prominent among his revilers is Robert Greene, a fellow alumnus of Cambridge who also makes a living from writing, although with considerably less success than the object of his slanders. Stung by envy at Marlowe's eminence in the literary scene, Greene mounts a smear campaign against him which eventually makes *Merlin* a byword for atheism. The name variant, together with the unsavoury associations it picks up, is used by some of Marlowe's colleagues in Service at a moment when doubts begin to be raised concerning his reliability, as well as by John Poole, a counterfeiter imprisoned at Newgate. The pejorative use of *Merlin* originates in the slums and prisons of Elizabethan London, and from there extends to the lower reaches of government service.

11.3.2.1. *The Equation of Marlowe with Tamburlaine*

Both the ameliorative and pejorative use of *Merlin* have their origin in the identification of Marlowe with Tamburlaine, the Scythian shepherd whose career as all-conquering warlord is recreated in his first two plays. The resounding success of *1. Tamburlaine* incurs Greene's bitter and lasting enmity, moving him first to emulate Marlowe by plagiarising his work, and then to denigrate him alleging the immorality of his plays. The equally successful *2. Tamburlaine* attracts Raleigh's notice to its author, who is subsequently invited to join the courtier's intellectual circle. Marlowe's co-option into the Raleigh set serves Greene as pretext for, and substantiation of, the rumours of the dramatist's atheism he puts about. "Sir Walter's strange doings with mathematicians and atheists" [p.69] have not escaped the notice of the Service, making Marlowe guilty of atheism by association, and in turn lending credence to Greene's denunciations of the

latter's plays as a vehicle for the dissemination of atheistical ideas. The almost universal acclaim for the artistic mastery of Marlowe's plays goes hand in hand with a growing concern for the moral soundness of the perspective brought to bear on the themes explored in them.

Raleigh and Greene concur in labelling Tamburlaine an atheist. The former's introduction of "Merlin," who "has pounded London ears with the atheistical ravings of his Tamburlaine," proleptically echoes Greene's riposte "suche madde and scoffing poets that have prophetical spirites as bred of Merlin's race" that dare "God out of heaven with that atheist Tamburlan" [p.145]. Neither statement predicates atheism of Marlowe, as "the atheistical ravings" are attributed to Tamburlaine so that the term *atheist* is applied to the character rather than his creator. In both instances, however, the creator-creation relationship between Marlowe and Tamburlaine favours the identification of the one with the other. As Marlowe puts it on an earlier occasion, "[c]reate a villain and you become a villain" [p.23]. Raleigh's query as to whether "Tamburlaine [is] the enlargement of Merlin" [p.137] is in effect a recasting of Marlowe's observation: Marlowe has created an atheist because he is one himself. The question is parried with the disclaimer "I must create men and women and eke voices for them, but they are not my voices." To affirm that the atheism of a character is a reflection of the atheism of its creator is *non sequitur* resulting from an irrelevant association between the two.

When Marlowe confronts him over the libel of "suche madde and scoffing poets," however, what comfort that might be derived from the thought that "Kit (…) was not termed atheist but the fabricator of one" [p.146] is dispelled. Greene's introductory

> 47. This is Merlin the Marlin that dared God out of heaven [p.146]

effectively fuses Marlowe into Tamburlaine. Daring "God out of heaven" alludes to the episode in *2 Tamburlaine* in which the hero seeks to provoke the prophet Mohammed by burning the Koran

> Now, Mahomet, if thou have any power,
> Come down thyself and work a miracle.
> Thou art not worthy to be worshipped
> That suffers flames of fire to burn the writ
> Wherein the sum of thy religion sits
> (V i 185-200),

and which is interpreted as an avowal of atheism. In contrast to what is asserted in the libel, that it is Tamburlaine that issues the challenge, Greene now attributes this act of

hubris to his creator. The referent of *the Marlin* is *Merlin's* in "of Merlin's race as well as the *Merlin* of Greene's introduction, which in turn refers to Marlowe, unequivocally identifying him as the target of the libel. As the antecedent of the restrictive relative clause *that dared God out of heaven*, moreover, *the Marlin* also refers back to *that atheist Tamburlan*, which governs "daring God out of heaven" in the libel. The upshot of this cross-referencing is the establishment of the co-referentiality of *Merlin*, *the Marlin* and *Tamburlan*, effectively constituting an affirmative answer to Raleigh's question of whether Tamburlaine is "but the enlargement of Merlin."

11.3.2.2. *The Substitution of* Merlin *for* Marlin

Excerpt [47], like [45], is as much an example of performative as it is of didactic naming. The wording of Greene's introduction creates the impression of the recent imposition of *Merlin* and the consequent displacement of *Marlin*, an impression which receives corroboration from the incident in which he discovers that he is the target of a character assassination:

> —Mr Marlin the ace, he is.
> —Pardon me?
> —Atheist, he means, Bradley said. He has never seen the word writ down [p.143].

On remarking later that "Bradley to me spoke the word *atheist*," Marlowe is informed that the source of the slander is "Robin Greene," who "has his bully Ball bawling it about" [p.144]. In parroting what Ball is instructed to broadcast, Bradley's companion mispronounces *atheist*, but not *Marlin*, strongly suggesting that this variant of the family name is the one that Greene used before adopting *Merlin*.

To account for the naming convention Greene institutes, one may start by turning to the parallelism observed in the answer given in

42. —You are truly Merlin? The Earl smiled.
—Merlin or Marlin or Marley or Marlowe [p.137].

The reply is a disjunctive conjoin whose conjuncts are in turn disjunctive conjoins whose conjuncts are variant forms of Marlowe's family name. Each conjoin offers a choice of variant, between *Marlin* and *Merlin* on the one hand, and *Marley* and *Marlowe* on the other. In 11.2 it is suggested that each of the conjuncts making up the latter conjoin expresses a different identity, *Marley* Marlowe's inherited, familial persona, and *Marlowe* the persona he is striving to create for himself. *Marlin*, on the other hand, is the variant that figures most frequently in the records of Corpus Christi

College (Bakeless 1942: 66-74 *passim*; Nicholl 1992: 203; Riggs 2004: 31), and therefore the form Marlowe's quondam schoolfellow Greene might have been most familiar with. Consequently, just as *Marley* is associated with Marlowe's origins at Canterbury, *Marlin* is bound up with the academic and religious values of his alma mater. In both cases the choice of one variant at the expense of the other symbolises the severance of the ties which bind their bearer to Canterbury and Cambridge and what these places stand for. Marlowe's choice epitomises his estrangement from his family, whereas Greene's renaming him denounces Marlowe's defection from the values instilled at university.

The substitution of *Merlin* for *Marlin* is greatly facilitated by the close phonological bond between them (Riggs 2004: 31). However, the relation between the two variants is more complex than it appears at first sight. While in Present-Day English their relation is one of apophony, in the late sixteenth century, the period in which the novel is set, the variants are homophonous. In this period late Middle English /ɛr/ had become /ar/, written *-ar-*, before evolving to its present-day pronunciation of /ɛː/, all the while conserving the *-er-* spelling (Barber 1997 [1976]: 118). Since the change of pronunciation affecting *Merlin* —from ['mɛrlɪn] to ['marlɪn]— is not accompanied by a change of spelling, it becomes a co-homophone, facilitating the substitution of one variant for the other.

11.3.2.3. Merlin *as a Byword for Atheism*

While *Marlowe* seems to be the variant of the bearer's choice, *Merlin* is imposed on him. Given the namer's hostility towards Marlowe, the imposition of the alternate form triggers a process analogous to that of pejorative change so that its use is invariably accompanied by the delivering of a negative value-judgement on the bearer (Burgess 1975 [1964]: 108). From being the name of King Arthur's trusty and trustworthy adviser, *Merlin* is transformed into a contemptuous appellation for a loutish sceptic with the effrontery to air in public his disregard for religion and learning in the form of spectacular catchpenny entertainment.

On a closer inspection, however, pejorative change does not affect *Merlin*, but the variant it replaces, *Marlin*. Returning to [47], the term *atheist*, although absent from the excerpt, is elicited in part by the allusion to the challenge Tamburlaine issues to Mohammed in the relative clause, and in part by earlier mentions of *Tamburlaine* in which it co-occurs with *atheist*, namely "atheistical ravings of his Tamburlaine" in [45]

and “that atheist Tamburlan” in Greene’s libel. What merits comment about the instance [47] is the semantic contagion of *Marlin* resulting from its modification by *that dared God out of heaven*. The relative clause paraphrases *the ace he is*, the garbled form of *atheist* in the byname appended to *Mr Marlin* from the exchange cited in 11.3.2.2. It is the semantic contagion of *Marlin* by its co-occurrence with *atheist* and its paraphrase that brings about its substitution by *Merlin*, suggesting that the latter variant already carries negative connotations.

Although traditionally depicted as a beneficial influence on King Arthur, Merlin arouses suspicions on account of his magical powers. The ability to work magic was thought to be the result of commerce with the Devil on the part of those who possess it, which by implication means that Merlin must have had dealings with God’s adversary. The suspicion of the magician’s diabolical association is seemingly borne out by the relation of his birth given in Geoffrey of Monmouth’s *History of the Kings of Britain*, one of the first written sources for Arthurian romance. In his audience with King Vortigern it comes out that Merlin is the offspring of a nun and an incubus, a demon in the form of a man (1983: 167-8)[34]. Interestingly, sodomites were also believed to be the progeny of such diabolical unions, underwritten by the association of sodomy with sorcery in the symbolic universe of Elizabethan England (Bray 1982: 21). Consequently, the switch to *Merlin* may be construed as a slur on Marlowe’s homosexuality as well as his apostasy. Greene’s parting shot “[f]our bare legs in bed, a pitiful prick that shies at a woman making up the limping five” [p.149] scores off Marlowe with a barbed allusion to his indifference to women contained in a hit against the facile art of composing iambic pentameters. The association of sodomy with sorcery embodied in *Merlin* is strengthened in the mass hysteria caused by *Dr Faustus*, as a result of which Marlowe is “pointed at as one that could raise the Devil with Latin, and with Greek call back Helen of Troy from the dead” [p.156]. The switch from *Marlin* to *Merlin*, it would seem, is prompted as much by his sexual orientation and interest in the occult as by his atheism.

The existing connotations of sorcery and devil worship carried by *Merlin* chime in with the early Modern meaning of nonconformity conveyed by *atheism* and *atheist*. Being in league with the Devil signifies rebellion against God, not the denial of his existence. This is made patent by the definition of *atheist* given by John Lyly: “by

[34] See Thorpe (trad.).

atheist we may mean you reject the Church of the Reform" [p.161]. Accordingly, an atheist is one that denies not so much the existence of God as the validity of the official theological system, in this case that of the Anglican Church. The looser definition of the term is consistent with more technical accounts of atheism, such as "atheism, historically considered, has meant no more in the past critical or sceptical denial of those who have employed the term as one of reproach" (The New Catholic Encyclopaedia, 2005). Moreover, a careful reading of the speech alluded to by Greene's libel reveals that Tamburlaine's atheism to be an expression of his defiance of institutional religion: Mohammed's failure to strike Tamburlaine down for his act of blasphemy does not demonstrate his inexistence, but exposes him as a fraud unworthy of worship. The acquired associations of *Merlin* therefore qualify Marlowe's atheism at the same time they underwrite it. The name variant labels him as an enemy of God because of his contempt for religion, and not as one who denies his existence.

11.3.2.4. *The Extension of the Pejorative Use of* Merlin

As Greene's smear campaign against him gathers momentum, Marlowe's notoriety transcends the rumour mills of the literary bohemia and criminal underworld of London to acquire purchase in official quarters. The ripple effect provoked by Greene's muckraking begins to make itself felt at the time Marlowe is held on remanded custody in Newgate. While in prison, he is addressed as first as *Marlin*, and then *Merlin*:

57. I see two poets here, I am honoured, Marlin, he said bowing to Tom, and the other one, bowing to Kit [p.172]
48. Skeres greeted him familiarly with *Kit Merlin* [p.175].

The order in which the variants appear re-enacts Greene's switch from *Marlin* to *Merlin*, only that each one is used by a different character. In [57] the namer is John Poole, a fellow inmate and possibly a nark working for Richard Baines, and Marlowe's old but unwelcome colleague Skeres, who brings news of the detainee's imminent release. As Skeres is a government servant on official business, his preference for *Merlin* not only signals the dimensions Greene's aspersions have taken on, it also brings home the dangers inherent in being reputed an atheist in a confessional state. The authorities have got wind of the rumours of Marlowe's atheism, with the attendant danger that they might order an investigation to ascertain the truth of the aspersions cast on him.

What is most striking about Skeres's greeting is the typographical foregrounding of the demotic full name by italicising it. The reason why the name should be highlighted is that its use marks a turning point, both in Skeres's style in addressing Marlowe and the latter's relationship with the Service. As argued in 9.3.2, the change from no-naming to the casual style signals not only Marlowe's resumption of his duties but also the impossibility of leaving government service again. The choice of family name is highly significant against the background of his enforced return to the fold. The use of the variant Greene has popularised gives to understand that the Service has been keeping tabs on Marlowe, and is consequently *au courant* with the disrepute he has fallen into. It also insinuates that they may use the widespread currency these allegations of atheism have gained against him if he continues to cause them trouble. As long as he is compliant with their demands, Marlowe will be protected from damaging consequences of being labelled an atheist; but the moment he steps out of line, he will be thrown to the wolves without compunction. If *Kit* is a reminder of the stake the Service have on Marlowe, *Merlin* is a warning of the hold they have on him.

The precariousness of Marlowe's situation resulting from his reputation for atheism is brought home to him by the vocative address in

49. —This is hypocrisy, you know it to be so, Merlin the atheist [p.188].

To begin with, he is no longer among the convicted criminals and stool pigeons of Newgate: he is in Robert Poley's London residence being debriefed after the first mission after rejoining the Service. Poley is at this moment the acting head of the organisation so that his address to Marlowe by the uncomplimentary sobriquet is an indication that the rumours of his atheism have reached them, as well as an insinuation that these rumours can be referred to a higher authority. Reading between the lines, the byname is a subtle means of coercing Marlowe into compliance. If he refuses to collaborate with the Service, the question of his reputed atheism will be passed on to the Privy Council. From a slur on his character *Merlin* has become a weapon that can be used against him.

At later interview Poley calls Marlowe by the same demotic full name used in Skeres's greeting in [48]:

50. your friend Robin Poley will be steadfast in the old policies and have power enough, and (…) Kit Merlin will do his duty when he can [pp.203-4].

The reassurance conveyed by *your friend* is undercut by the associations of waywardness and vulnerability conjured up by *Kit*. As a byword for atheism, *Merlin* draws attention to the relation of causality that obtains between the feline qualities which have inhered in the familiar name and the connotations of godlessness acquired by the variant of his family name. Marlowe's alleged atheism is an instance of his waywardness in matters of faith, and the obloquy this brings down on him shows up how his wilfulness ultimately isolates him and exposes him to the indignation of those he has offended and frightened. As a result, the connotations of waywardness carried by *Kit* are absorbed by the family name so that the familiar name conveys vulnerability only. The specialisation carried out by each element of the full name accordingly lexicalises the causal relation between Marlowe's vulnerability and waywardness: *Kit* standing for his vulnerability, and *Merlin* his waywardness. The connection between waywardness and vulnerability is driven home by the fate which befalls Marlowe's wonder-working namesake in Sir Thomas Malory's *Le Morte d'Arthur*: Merlin falls in love with one of the Ladies of the Lake, who tricks into entering a rock beneath a great stone and shutting him in there (1969: 118)[35]. The account of the death of King Arthur's counsellor parallels the fate which befalls Marlowe, deceived and betrayed by the person he doted on, making the variant *Merlin* a presage of his end.

11.4. The Initial Stigmatisation of *Marlowe*

With Poley's vaguely comminatory dismissal in [50], *Merlin* for the primary identification of Marlowe begins to fall into abeyance. However, the persona of the ranting atheist attached to this variant of his family name does not disappear with it, but is transferred to *Marlowe*, the variant associated with the identity its bearer has fashioned for himself. The spill-over of the atheistic connotations of the one variant to the other occurs concurrently with the establishment of Marlowe's reputation for profanity. In contrast to *Merlin*, whose use in this sense never goes beyond the *demimonde* of late Tudor London, the pejorative change undergone by *Marlowe* invariably takes place in an institutional setting: originating in the torture chambers of the Elizabethan police state and spreading to its higher echelons. Ironically, Marlowe's choice of name is finally accepted, but converted into a stigma of his iniquity.

[35] See Cowen (ed.).

Marlowe's proposal that Thomas Kyd might copy a theological disputation refuting Socinian ideas for its discussion in Raleigh's circle [p.194] leads off the replacement of *Merlin* with *Marlowe*. In the course of a government clampdown against seditious libellers Kyd is arrested and interrogated under torture, and his papers are seized and examined, including the manuscript transcribed at Marlowe's request, as a result of which the latter is implicated and brought before the Privy Council to answer for the "vile heretical conceits" contained in the confiscated document. After an inconclusive hearing, Richard Baines, the informer who engineers Marlowe's meeting with John Poole in Newgate, submits a report itemising the heretical and treasonable remarks he claims to have heard the respondent make. On the strength of Baines's report the Privy Councillors come to the conclusion that the imputations of atheism made against Marlowe are true, and tacitly resolve to take action. A few days later, Marlowe is in Deptford to keep an appointment with Robert Poley, where he is done to death.

As regards the confirmation of the bad name Marlowe is given in the chain of events leading up to his murder, two phases may be distinguished. The first is Kyd's interrogation and torture in Bridewell, which results in Marlowe being drawn into the witch-hunt, and in which both the detainee and his interrogators refer to the former's erstwhile colleague by his family name, mentioning several variants before settling for *Marlowe*. The second phase is Marlowe's appearance before the Privy Council, at the end of which his guilt is taken as established, and in course of which each of his inquisitors address him by a different variant of his family name. The confusion over which form to use is settled by Baines's report, which shows a preference for *Marlowe*. Quite independently from one another, each situation resolves the question of Marlowe's identity in the same way, linking it withal to the atheistical persona foisted upon him.

11.4.1. Marlowe *in Kyd's Interrogation*

In the variety of forms used, the references to Marlowe by his family name during Kyd's interrogation bear a strong resemblance to his self-introductions. On the two occasions Kyd incriminates him several variants of the name are mentioned, invariably with *Marlowe* in a prominent position:

> 54. Writ under constraint. Dagger at back. Mr Marlin, Marley, Marlowe. Kyd swooned but was face-flapped back to attention.
> —Marlowe of *Tamburlaine* and *The Jew* [p.234]?

55. This now must be explained. And he gave Kyd a cooling draught from the waved papers marked Vile Heretical Conceits.
—I have already. Marlowe.
—Or Marley or Morley or Merlin [p.236].

Of the medley of forms reeled off in each case *Marlowe* seems to be singled out as the variant that truly identifies their bearer.

On viewing the fragments together, a number of features come to notice. The first thing that warrants attention is that between the two excerpts the entire gamut of variants used in the novel are all mentioned. The second is that Kyd shows a preference for *Marlowe*: in [54] Marlowe's preferred form is the last mentioned of three variants, whereas in [55] it is the only form of the family name he uses. Further, the enumeration made in the former extract seems to represent the process whereby Marlowe attempts to define his own individuality against the identities imposed on him. *Marlin*, it will be remembered, is the variant associated with his student days and later transformed into *Merlin*, while *Marley* is the variant related to his family and their values. In [54], however, Kyd's preference for *Marlowe* is countered by a fresh enumeration from his interrogator. The hesitation over which variant to use would suggest the is persistence of some doubt over Marlowe's identity, at least as far as the authorities are concerned.

Another feature meriting comment is that the variant closing the enumeration in [55] is *Merlin*. The official who amplifies Kyd's identification of the person responsible for the manuscript is described as "a servant of the Privy Council," and therefore of "a higher order" than the interrogator in [54] who recognises the bearer of *Marlowe* as the author of *Tamburlaine* and *The Jew of Malta*. Given the connotations it carries, the prominence accorded to *Merlin* by a senior bureaucrat implies that Marlowe's reputed atheism has reached the inner circles of the government, and that in sending him to question Kyd, they wish to ascertain the truth of these allegations. On referring to Marlowe again, however, the government official uses *Marlowe*:

56. —A man of violence, you say, this Marlowe. Also of violent and atheistical speech, as is much reported. His atheism has gone into recent print. Or the imputation thereof. You confirm this from your knowledge [p.237]?

The official's acceptance of *Marlowe* not only definitively sanctions the form, it also signals the substitution of this variant for *Merlin* as the byword for religious scepticism. The process whereby it becomes a byword is identical to that undergone by its predecessor, namely by its co-occurrence with *atheistical* and *atheism*. The affirmative

answer given to the official's question clinches the matter, and when Marlowe is referred to again it is by its newly sanctioned form:

> 53. Mr Henry Maunder was directed, in the words of his commission, to repair to the house of Mr Thomas Walsingham or to any other place where he shall understand Christopher Marlowe to be staying and to apprehend him and bring him to court.

The appearance of *Marlowe* on the warrant for its bearer's arrest standardises it, although its association with atheism depends on the outcome of the hearing before the Privy Council.

11.4.2. Marlowe *at the Commission of Inquiry*

The use of Marlowe's family name at the hearing before the Privy Council follows the pattern established in the third degree Kyd is subjected to: that is, the resolution of name density in favour of *Marlowe*. At the hearing, however, the variants of the family name used are distributed among the Privy Councillors. Instead of reciting the entire catalogue of forms, as observed in [54]-[55], each of Marlowe's inquisitors addresses him by a single variant that differs from those used by their fellow Councillors:

> 58. —This, Sir Thomas Heneage said most reasonably, (…) Mr Marlowe has been one of the faithful hounds that smell out treason and dissidence. He is a master of arts. He is known to be a most mellifluous poet [p.244]
> 59. —Enough, the Archbishop said. Mr Marley, I am unhappy about the condition of your Christian faith
> 60. —I must ask you, Mr Marlin, Sir Robert Cecil said, to consult your own situation as regards the present enquiry [p.245].

At the adjournment of the hearing the Councillors retire to deliberate "on this Mr Marley or Merlin," the hesitation over the variant indicating that the question of the respondent's identification remains unresolved. The submission of Baines's report on Marlowe's blasphemy and treason settles this question:

> 61. A note containing the opinion of one Christopher Marley concerning his damnable judgement of religion and scorn of God's world [sic] (…) Mr Richard Chomley (…) has confessed that he was persuaded by Marlowe to become an atheist [pp.246-7].

Despite the inconsistency in the references to Marlowe, the enhanced information value accorded to *Marlowe* on account of its being the last-mentioned form definitively fixes this variant as the standard form of the family name, its standardisation underwritten by its appearance in a document. As the report is an indictment, the standardisation of *Marlowe* entails official confirmation that the bearer of name is an atheist and a traitor, with the result that the family name is rendered synonymous with atheism and treason.

11.4.2.1. *The Persistence of Name Density*

Since Marlowe's summons to the Privy Council follows on from the deposition exacted from Kyd, the Councillor's indecision over the respondent's name may be understood as an indication of the division of opinions over the accusations levelled at him. On this account the variants of the family name are to be construed as expressions of the differing perceptions of the bearer held by their respective users, an interpretation suggested by the meanings acquired by each of the variants in the course of the narrative.

The variant in [58] would suggest the user's friendly disposition towards Marlowe. Not only is *Marlowe* the bearer's preferred form of the name, it is also the variant employed in the certificate dispatched by the Privy Council to the authorities of Cambridge University enjoining them to grant Marlowe his MA degree (see 11.5.1). Sir Thomas Heneage is as fulsome in his praise of Marlowe as the Privy Council formerly were in their commendation of the latter's "faithful dealing." As well as the good service rendered to Her Majesty, Marlowe's academic distinction and literary talents are extolled, making it clear that *Marlowe* is free from the taint of atheism attached to the name in the course of Kyd's torture and interrogation at Bridewell. Heneage's advocacy of the respondent is to a large degree due to his recent appointment as the new head of Francis Walsingham's intelligence service. This makes Marlowe his man, whom he has an obligation to protect: hence his willingness to speak up for his subordinate.

Less benevolent is John Whitgift, the Archbishop of Canterbury. It is oddly fitting that the variant he addresses Marlowe with, *Marley*, should be the one identified with the bearer's origins and the expectations he has failed to live up to. Canterbury is at once Marlowe's home town and the seat of the Primate of all England so that Whitgift's concern for the respondent's condition of his Christian faith is linked to his weakening ties with the city of his birth and all it stands for. The Archbishop's use of *Marley* serves not only as a reminder of the past Marlowe has turned his back on, but also as a warning of the perdition resulting from the progression from the inherited form of the family name to the bearer's preferred form. Implicitly, *Marlowe* is beginning to take on connotations of errancy, if not of downright heresy.

Equally unpromising is Robert Cecil's use of *Marlin* in [60]. Like *Marley* this variant is a link to Marlowe's past he wishes to dissociate himself from, though to Cambridge rather than Canterbury (see 11.3.2.2). The unpropitious character of *Marlin* stems from

its stigmatisation and subsequent transformation into *Merlin*, the variant which becomes the label broadcasting the atheism of the individual bearing it. More explicitly than that from *Marley* to *Marlowe*, the transition from *Marlin* to *Merlin* traces their bearer's lapse into unorthodoxy, although at this stage it is a potential rather than an actual decline.

Although Cecil and Whitgift become increasingly ill-disposed towards Marlowe, mainly because of the respondent's insolence, the most aggressive of his inquisitors is the earl of Essex. The latter's aggressiveness can be put down to his interest to have his peers believe Marlowe to be guilty of the allegations brought against him, in turn attributable to the knowledge that the playwright is an associate of Walter Raleigh's, the earl's bitterest enemy. What is significant about his addresses to Marlowe is that Essex never calls him by his name. The avoidance of the family name may be indicative of Essex's impatience with the proceedings: Marlowe is guilty simply by virtue of being a protégé of "that man Raleigh," and since his guilt is clearly established, the quibbles over his identity are merely a waste of time. No-naming reflects the perception of the respondent as a reprobate, although his culpability stems more from his friendship with Raleigh than his heterodoxy.

11.4.2.2. *The Resolution of Name Density*

In the narrative report of the Councillors' deliberations on Marlowe's imputed atheism following his dismissal there is a slight reduction in name density. Of the three variants the respondent is addressed by during the hearing, *Marlowe* is dropped, and *Marlin* replaced by *Merlin*. Owing to the atheistic associations of the preferred variant, the simplification suggests an inclination towards the confirmation of the allegations made against Marlowe.

The dropping of *Marlowe* would indicate that Heneage's vindication of his subordinate has failed to make an impression on his more hawkish colleagues. In Whitgift's mouth *Marley* stands not so much for Marlowe's origins as his forsaking the values associated with his origins. The substitution of *Merlin* for *Marlin* is even more ominous, because it is a repetition of the singularisation undergone by the family name during Greene's defamation of Marlowe. Despite the unfavourable nuances it has acquired, *Marley* is a link to Marlowe's forsaken past, carrying the implication that the break with what that past represents is not irreversible, and that Marlowe may return to his former state. By contrast, *Merlin*, with its Faustian overtones, would identify its bearer as one that has gone beyond the point of no return and is past saving. If exclusive

meaning is assigned to it, the disjunctive coordinator conjoining *Marley* and *Merlin* in "this Mr Marley or Merlin" may be read as expressing the Councillor's doubt as to which of the two states each conjunct symbolises is applicable. Marlowe is certainly a transgressor, but it is not known whether his transgression is mere errancy which can be corrected or so deeply ingrained as to place him beyond the pale.

The issue is decided with the submission of Baines's report. The litany of blasphemous and treasonable remarks it contains is what finally convinces the Councillors of the gravity of Marlowe's unorthodoxy, not least because they appear in writing. The transition from simple wrong-headedness to obdurate godlessness and treason is signalled by the shift from *Marley* to *Marlowe* in the report. While the former variant retains the connotations acquired by Whitgift's use of it, the latter replaces *Merlin* and, in replacing it, picks up the connotations of atheism that has adhered to it. In other words, the process observed in the interrogation of Kyd in Bridewell is repeated in Westminster. Since the Privy Council is, after the Queen, the highest authority in the kingdom, the repetition of the standardising process is tantamount to sanctioning it. Name density is finally resolved in favour of his preferred variant, but at the expense of becoming a stigma that advertises the iniquity of its bearer.

11.5. The Definitive Stigmatisation of *Marlowe*

Apart from the Baines note, which is partially reproduced at the end of the episode recreating Marlowe's appearance before the Privy Council, three other authentic documents concerning the historical Christopher Marlowe are written into the narrative. These documents are the Privy Council's certificate of Marlowe's good conduct [51], the warrant to have him brought to Westminster to answer the allegations of atheism made against him [52], and the inquest findings into his violent death at Deptford [53]. As it will be argued in this section, the documents cited are responsible both for the definitive stigmatisation and standardisation of *Marlowe*.

11.5.1. Implications of the Uniformity of the Family Name

What merits attention about the documents cited is the uniformity regarding the recipient's family name. In contrast to the diversity of variants that characterises the naming reviewed in this chapter, *Marlowe* is the form invariably used on the eleven occasions the family name is mentioned in the documents quoted, whether singly or as part of the bearer's full name. What is not so obvious is that this homogeneity is not

found in the original documents as they have come down to us, but is the result of respelling the variants of the family name in compliance with the naming practices applied to the historical Christopher Marlowe we are familiar with today.

The first inkling of the contrived nature of the standard use of *Marlowe* displayed by the documents is provided by the aside inserted in the certificate of good conduct issued by the Privy Council:

> 51. Whereas it was reported that Christopher Marlowe (so that is your name) was determined to have gone beyond the seas to Rheims there to remain, their Lordships think it good to certify that he had no such intention and that in all his actions he has behaved he himself orderly and discreetly, whereby he has done Her Majesty good service and deserves to be rewarded for his faithful dealing [p.112].

More than expressing discovery of Marlowe's identity the parenthetical remark draws attention to it. The reason why his name should be an object of our attention is due in part to the fact that it is the first occasion that one variant of the family name occurs by itself. Up to the reading of the certificate the uses of the family name have without exception consisted in a recital of variants, often ending with either an invitation to the addressee to take his pick or a request to the bearer for enlightenment as to which variant to use. In this regard the co-ordinating conjunction *so* has the effect of rendering *Marlowe* the answer to the demand "What are you - Merlin or Marlin or Morley?" [p.111] made prior to the reading of the certificate. On the other hand, the Narrator's aside also intimates that there is more that meets the eye regarding *Marlowe*. The intimation is borne out when the certificate as reproduced in the narrative is contrasted with the original, which reads: "Whereas it was reported that Christopher *Morley*[36] was determined to have gone beyond the seas to Reames [Rheims]" (quoted in Hotson 1925: 58; Boas 1940: 22; Bakeless 1942: 77; Nicholl 1992: 92; Downie 2000: 15). *Marlowe*, then, has been substituted for *Morley*. The discovery of the substitution raises the question of whether the family name has been amended in the other two documents as well.

On cross-checking each quotation against their respective originals, one finds that while the quotation of the coroner's report involves the substitution of one variant of the family name by another, in the warrant for Marlowe's arrest no amendment to the name has been made other than a slight change of spelling. Thus, in the novel Henry Maunder, one of the queen's couriers, is reported as being ordered

[36] Emphasis added.

> 52. to repair to the house of Mr Thomas Walsingham or to any other place where he shall understand Christopher Marlowe to be staying and to apprehend him and bring him to court [p.237],

as opposed to

> to repaire to the house of Mr Tho. Walsingham in Kent, or to anie other place where he shall vnderstand Christofer Marlow to be remaining, and by vertue thereof to apprehend, and bring his to the Court in his Companie (quoted in Boas 1940: 244[37]).

Save for the adding of the diacritic *-e*, the family name in the quotation is identical in form to the one in the original: indeed, *Marlow* is now considered as an alternative spelling for *Marlowe* (Reaney & Wilson 1997 [1958]: 299).

Turning to the coroner's report, one finds that *Morley* has been replaced with *Marlowe*. Given its length, only a portion of the inquest findings will be cited, both as it appears in the novel and Hotson's translation of the Latin original (1925: 31-4). The extract selected relates the struggle that ensued after Marlowe snatched Ingram Frizer's dagger and tried to stab him with it, in the course of which the latter,

> in his own defence & for the saving of his life, then & there struggled with the said Christopher Morley to get back from him his dagger aforesaid; in which affray the same Ingram could not get away from the said Christopher Morley; his dagger, and so it befell in that affray that the said Ingram, in defence of his life, with the dagger aforesaid of the value of 12*d*. gave the said Christopher a mortal wound over his right eye of the depth of the depth of two inches & of the width of one inch; of which mortal wound the aforesaid Christopher Morley then & there instantly died (quoted in Bakeless 1942: 156),

which is rendered as follows:

> 53. in his own defence and for the saving of his life then and there struggled with Christopher Marlowe to get away from his dagger, in which affray Ingram could not get away from Marlowe; and so it befell that in that affray Ingram in defence of his life, with the dagger aforesaid to the value of 12d, gave Christopher a mortal wound over his right eye of which wound Christopher Marlowe then and there instantly died [p.268].

Leaving aside the simplification undergone by the original, such as the systematic suppression of the legal formulae *the said* and *aforesaid* prefixed to the personal names, the features to observe are the consistency with which *Morley* is used in the first quote and the consistency with which it is substituted by *Marlowe* in the second. This impression is confirmed on reading Hotson's translation is read in full and contrasted with Burgess's rendering of it: *Christopher Morley* makes eleven appearances in the

[37] The warrant is also quoted in Nicholl 1992: 46, although the spelling has been modernised except for the two personal names.

former as against the seven occurrences in the latter of *Christopher Marlowe*, and the two of *Marlowe*. Despite the disparity in the number of namings, and despite the differences in the type of naming made, the cross-check strongly suggests the existence of a design of some sort behind the preference for *Marlowe*, not only in the coroner's report but in the other two documents cited as well.

Having uncovered the systematic substitution of *Marlowe* for *Morley*, there now remains the task of discovering the stylistic purpose served by these changes, especially as regards the stigmatisation of Marlowe. Perhaps the most obvious reason for this standardisation of *Marlowe* is sheer familiarity. The present-day reader uninformed of the facts and apocrypha concerning Christopher Marlowe might be unaware of the protean quality of the dramatist's family name, and as a result is likely to be disoriented when confronted by *Morley*. This, however, does not square with the great play made of the variety exhibited by the name throughout the narrative. The practice of mentioning an array of different forms whenever the protagonist's family name is employed effectively familiarises historically uninitiated readers to its capricious nature, allowing them to recognise the bearer of *Morley*, *Marley*, *Marlin* and *Merlin* as the individual known to them as *Christopher Marlowe*.

The contrast between the uniformity shown in the documents cited and the diversity exhibited by the characters' use of the family name may hold the clue to the amendment of *Morley* to *Marlowe* in the former case. As seen in 11.3 and 11.4, there is a tendency towards a standard form in the latter situation, first in favour of *Merlin*, and then of *Marlowe*. None the less, no such process is discernible in the three documents embedded in the narrative because *Marlowe* is the formed used from the outset, its stability attributable to the medium in which the variant occurs. Writing is an agent of standardisation insomuch as the written word is not so liable to change as the spoken one is; and once "endited in good black lasting ink," the written word serves as a model for future renderings, in speech as well as in writing (Farey, 2006). Consequently, the consistency lent to *Marlowe* by virtue of its appearing frequently in a written medium, together with the official character of the documents it appears in, makes for the standardisation of this variant at the expense of its rivals, *Marley*, *Marlin* and *Merlin*.

The process whereby *Marlowe* becomes the standard form of the family name is not one-sided, however. On viewing the certificate, the warrant and the coroner's report together and in the order in which they appear in the narrative, the name is stigmatised, as it is in Kyd's interrogation. Marlowe's transformation from an orderly and discreet

government servant to a suspected malefactor and would-be homicide lends credence to the accusations of atheism and gratuitous violence made against him, the subsequent deterioration of his reputation being reflected on his name. Pejorative change, then, runs parallel with standardisation, and to see how this change comes about in more detail each of the three documents will be examined in turn, paying attention to the elements of the co-text which contribute to the process.

11.5.2. The Certificate of Marlowe's Good Conduct

The use of *Marlowe* in the certificate of good conduct would seem to take its cue from the signature affixed to the written oath of allegiance sworn by the bearer on entering Francis Walsingham's service:

> 38. —The beginning is sure, being Marl or Merl or sometimes Morl, but we are not clear in the family whether it be Marley or Morley or Marlowe. I have in my time been called Merlin, the magician's name. This I write is, I think, Marlowe [p.27],

although there is some doubt over whether the signature is indeed this variant owing to its illegibility. Its use in a government document nevertheless confers on *Marlowe* the status of the *bona fide* form of the signatory's family name, as corroborated by its subsequent employment in the warrant and the coroner's inquisition. Further corroboration of its validation is provided by the presentation of *Marlowe* as the answer to the question educed by the aside "so that is your name," identified in the introduction to this section with the exasperated request "What are you - Merlin or Marlin or Morley?"

The demand for positive identification places the certificate for good conduct within the context of the first suspicions regarding Marlowe's religious orthodoxy. As suggested in the preamble to the certificate, its subject is rumoured be to be planning to run away to the exiled Catholics in the English College at Rheims, and on the strength of these rumours the authorities of Cambridge University have decided to block Marlowe's candidature to his MA degree. The certificate goes on to allay their fears that he is a Catholic malcontent, assuring the University authorities that "he had no such intention" but was engaged "in matters touching the benefit of his country," and enjoining them to put an end to the rumours and award him his degree [pp.112-3]. The certificate is, in short, a directive overruling the University's decision to take action against Marlowe for being a crypto-Catholic.

The incident concerning the MA degree occurs in a honeymoon period for Marlowe and the Service. He has acquitted himself well on the missions entrusted to him, and in return his employers are prepared to pull strings on his behalf. Yet the fact that the Privy Council sees itself obliged to vouch for their agent's integrity is in itself indicative of the reputation of untrustworthiness he is beginning to acquire. The certificate ends with a reference to Marlowe as one who has been "defamed by those who are ignorant in the affairs he went about" [p.113], at once a broad hint about the dirty-mindedness of the University authorities and a tacit admission of the responsibility of the Service for the suspicions cast on their agent.

The tenor of these defamations comes out in the course of the interview leading up to the reading of the certificate. Besides apostasy, Marlowe is accused of inciting a fellow student to devil worship and, in the words of the Master of his College, talking "loosely of religion" [p.112]. It is significant that in the Master's demand for accurate identification that begins the interview that *Marlowe* should be absent, and *Merlin* prominent, the latter variant later becoming synonymous with atheism. Of equal significance is the evasiveness shown by Marlowe in answering to the prominent variant, in contrast to the enthusiasm shown for it in [38]. Although "I have been called in my time called Merlin the magician's name" and "Merlin is a magical name. Some call me by it" [p.111] both stress *Merlin* as an imposition, in the latter utterance Marlowe disclaims all responsibility for the naming practice while in the former the same practice is a piece of information he volunteers. His circumspection is occasioned by the knowledge of the negative repercussions the magical associations the name can have for him, particularly at a moment in which his loyalty and probity are being called into question. He is just as circumspect in his reply to Henry Percy's query "[a]re you truly Merlin?" in [42]: "[t]he names of us common people (…) are fluid stuff" not only indicates the instability of the names of individuals of plebeian stock but also the impotence of their bearers to check it and avoid whatever undesirable associations the variants have.

The occurrence of Marlowe's preferred form of his family name in the certificate renders the document an official disclaimer of the imputation of heresy conveyed by *Merlin* as well as a guarantee of his good conduct. Not only do his employers defer to his preferences by referring to him as *Marlowe*: in using the variant with their praises of their servant's orderly and discreet behaviour, they also make it a symbol of the sterling qualities they attribute to its bearer. Unfortunately for Marlowe, the Service eventually

see him as a liability instead of an asset, a change of mind reflected in the substitution of *Marlowe* for *Merlin* as a byword for atheism. In the next official document cited, the variant no longer identifies one who "deserves to be rewarded for his faithful dealing" [p.112], but one charged with professing a "damnable judgement of religion and scorn of God's word[38]" [p.246].

11.5.3. The Summons to the Privy Council

The warrant empowering Henry Maunder to bring Marlowe before the Privy Council reinforces the trend whereby *Marlowe* becomes tainted with the Faustian connotations carried by *Merlin*, though without consolidating this trend. As discussed in 11.4.1, the singularisation of *Marlowe* that takes place during Kyd's detention involves transferring the atheistical associations attached to *Merlin* to the former variant. The upshot of its generalisation is that *Marlowe* now apparently signifies two different things, since the variant is the standard form by which the Service refers to Marlowe. Judging by the glowing testimonial given in [58], in which Marlowe is described a reliable agent, distinguished scholar and accomplished poet, in the Service *Marlowe* retains the positive meaning it has in the certificate, against the derogatory meaning it is acquiring. As regards his family name, then, there is a homogeneous naming convention applied to Marlowe offset by a disagreement over what the name conveys, a matter which is to be elucidated by the Privy Council.

The issue still hangs very much in the balance at the adjournment of the hearing. While Essex has prejudged the respondent as guilty of the accusations brought against him, and Whitgift and Cecil are prejudiced against him on account of his insolent bearing, Marlowe has the backing of the Service in the person of Heneage. The Baines note, as we have seen in 11.4.2.1, changes all this. Marlowe's blasphemous remarks read out to the Councillors bear out Kyd's claim that Marlowe is "ever mocking God and our blessed Saviour" [p.237]. From then on *Marlowe* is synonymous with malefactor, even for those who hitherto have been inclined to protect its bearer.

11.5.4. The Coroner's Inquisition into Marlowe's Death

The inquest finding into the Deptford affray marks the culmination of the twin process of the singularisation and stigmatisation of *Marlowe*. Marlowe is referred to by name a total of ten times, seven times by his full name and twice by his family name, and on all

[38] Written by mistake as *world* in the source text (see [61] introduction to 11.4.2).

nine occasions *Marlowe* is the variant used. The account given of the altercation resulting in his death reflects negatively on Marlowe, confirming the image of the irreligious thug that emerges from Kyd's deposition and the Baines note.

According to the coroner's report, the cause of the quarrel is a violent disagreement over who should pay for the meals taken by the company, identified as "Messrs Marlowe, Poley, Frizer, Skeres," throughout their sojourn at Widow Bull's:

> Ingram Frizer and Christopher Marlowe uttered one to the other divers malicious words for the reason that they could not agree about the payment of the sum of pence, that is *le recknynge*, there [p.268].

As the argument becomes more heated, Marlowe, "moved with anger," is reported to have made for Frizer, seated between Skeres and Poley at a table with his back to his assailant, and "on a sudden and of his malice against Ingram maliciously" have drawn the latter's dagger and inflicted "two wounds on his head." In the course of the ensuing struggle Frizer, "in his own defence and for the saving of his life," caused Marlowe to stab himself in the right eye so that he "then and there instantly died." The onus of the tragedy is placed squarely on its victim: not only is Marlowe identified as the aggressor, the polyptoton based on *malice* conspires to portray him as a violent and vindictive individual. The detail of stabbing himself in the eye, moreover, creates the impression of poetic justice having been done: the reprobate slain by the very weapon with which he intended to slay another.

The image of Marlowe as a man who treacherously attacks his intended victim from behind coincides with the testimony extracted from Kyd during his torture. When asked whether he wrote the "vile heretical conceits" found in his chambers, Marlowe's former associate answers "[w]rit under constraint. Dagger at back. Mr Marlin, Marley, Marlowe" [p.234]. That is, Marlowe resorted, quite literally, to the stab in the back to get Kyd to copy out the theological disputation, just as he resorts to it to settle the argument over the reckoning at Widow Bull's. Together with his atheism, Marlowe's ready recourse to violence is the focus of the second interrogation Kyd is subjected to. Kyd's description of him as an individual "of extremest violence" [p.236] is echoed and expanded on by his interrogator, who refers to "this Marlowe" as "a man of violence," as well as "of violent and atheistical speech" [p.237]. The Baines note, by contrast, concentrates on Marlowe's "damnable judgement of religion," making no reference to the brutality Kyd attributes to him. Yet a man who has reputedly declared that "Christ

was a bastard" who "deserved better to die than Barabbas" [p.247] is deemed to be capable of anything, from intimidating his associates to assaulting them unawares.

The coroner's report endorses the aspersions cast on Marlowe. It is a direct endorsement in the case of Kyd's imputations of violence, and an indirect one of Baine's libel on Marlowe's inconformity and blasphemy. The validating function performed by the report is anticipated in the reporting clause that introduces it, more specifically in the pun contained in the embedded participal clause "endited in good black lasting ink" [p.267]. The archaic term for 'write down' or 'record,' *endite*, is a homophonous cognate of *indict*, the legal term meaning 'accuse formally.' Through the coroner's findings *Marlowe* is fixed both as the standard form of the name (endited) and as a label that symbolises the infamy that has befallen its bearer (indicted). The adjective *lasting* makes reference to the perpetuation, and elevation to legend, of Marlowe's reputation of a godless rebel and atheist who was killed in a tavern brawl. *Marlowe* is no longer "subject to change in the process of onomastic circulation," and neither are the associations of atheism that have become inextricably linked to the name.

11.6. The Resurgence of Name Density and its Implications

Although the inquest findings resolve the variation shown by the family name in favour of *Marlowe*, there is a brief rebound of name density towards the end of the book. The epilogue following the coroner's report ends with an observation on Marlowe as the unacknowledged exponent of the English renaissance:

> The England that killed Kit Marlowe or Marley or Merlin will define itself in one of its facets by what he wrote before he died swearing [p.269].

It is the only occasion on which the Narrator names the playwright by his family name, and it is very likely to be an instance of mimicking the enumeration of variants the its mention so often gives rise to. In any case it is interesting to note that the variants cited are the forms invested with the most significance: Marlowe's preferred variant, which is eventually adopted as the standard form of the name; the inherited form, which he forsakes; and the form which is used to label him an atheist before being superseded by *Marlowe*. Given the meanings attached to each of the variants, the revival of name density may be construed as a bid to reopen the case concerning Marlowe's atheism, falsely settled by the Baines note and upheld by the coroner's report.

The need for the revision of the personality attached to *Christopher Marlowe* is also implied in the clause "before he died swearing," which conjures up the image of the

obdurate sinner who is unrepentant to the last[39]. In the following sentence the Narrator dismisses this image as "another lie," the first lie being the relation of Marlowe's death contained in the coroner's findings. If anybody swore at the instant of his death it was Frizer, who, in the version given by the Narrator preceding the report, is depicted as saying "[f]ilthy sodomite. Filthy buggereing seducer of men and boys. Godless sneering fleering bastard" [p.267] before driving the dagger home. Frizer's behaviour prior to the killing is indicative of an abiding feature of the Narrator's reconstruction of the events that occurred at Widow Bull's, namely that it reverses many of the circumstantial details contained in the official story. According to the coroner's report, Frizer was seated at a table between Skeres and Poley with his back to Marlowe when he was attacked, whereas in the Narrator's version it is Marlowe that is seated between Skeres and Poley, facing Frizer. Again, in the report Frizer is said to have started struggling with Marlowe because "he could in no wise take flight," while the Narrator has it that Marlowe could not escape from the knife thrust because Skeres and Poley had pinioned his arms. Finally, the report records that Marlowe was holding the dagger when it inadvertently went into his eye, which is contradicted by the Narrator, who says that Frizer deliberately thrust the dagger into Marlowe's eye with his own hand. In brief, the verdict of chance-medley returned by the jurymen is transformed into a cold-blooded murder by the Narrator, with the implication that if the inquest findings are based on a lie, the image they give of Marlowe as a homicidal brute is also a lie, as is his reputed atheism and blasphemy.

By the same token the Narrator's relation of the killing gives the lie to the affirmation that it was the result of an argument over who should pay the bill. Indeed, the coroner's report is immediately followed by an outburst of outraged disbelief:

> *Le reckynge?* What Frenchified madness is this? It is a lie of the language, unpurposed maybe, that is a badge or brooch of the lie of the whole [p.268].

Returning to the Narrator's version, the "lie of the language" that provokes his indignation is revealed. As in the coroner's report, there is an argument over the bill, but it is between Marlowe and Skeres. As the argument develops, moreover, it soon becomes apparent that Marlowe is being held to account for something else, namely that

[39] The clause alludes to the climax to the account of the playwright's death given some years after the event in Thomas Beard's *Theatre of God's Judgement*: "[Marlowe] even cursed and blasphemed to his last gasp, and together with his breath an oath flew out of his mouth" (quoted in Hotson 1925: 12; Boas 1940: 280; Steane 1964: 3; Nicholl 1992: 66).

he has outlived his usefulness and is to be eliminated to prevent him from divulging the secrets he has been privy to (see 9.3.3). Marlowe's death is attributable to a settling of accounts, but not in the sense of a "sum of pence," as given out in the inquest findings. The lie of the language referred to consists in the capacity of the term *reckoning* to give a misleading account of the killing on account of its polysemy.

The sequel to the Narrator's version of the double-coded disagreement over the payment of the bill is the kangaroo court Skeres sets up. The purpose of the court is not so much as to try Marlowe as to inform him that sentence of death has been passed over him, not because he has committed a crime, but because of the fear that he might commit one:

> You are in the situation of one that is no proper criminal, unmeet for trial or hanging. Of one, rather, that had best be voided. We (…) speak not of treachery but of its possibility [p.266].

The summing up continues:

> There is one reason for your being voided. There are two others, and you will never know whether it is a knight or an earl who wishes the voiding (…) One deletes you from life's book as a warning to others, or because he fears your tongue, or for dislike and no more, or as payment for insolence. The other is afraid of a speaking out under duress that will light the powder of his own ruin. Whatever it is, you had best go, though not out of that door.

The knight and the earl mentioned refer to Walter Raleigh and Essex respectively, the allusion to these two notables revealing the court Skeres presides to be a parodic replica of the commission of inquiry conducted by the Privy Council. What they have in common is their concern with Raleigh, although at the hearing this interest is a distraction from the business at hand while at Deptford it is central to the meeting. Both Poley and Essex seek Raleigh's downfall and see in Marlowe the means of bringing it about, the one trying to browbeat him into betraying Raleigh, and the other proposing a deal whereby he saves his neck in return for Raleigh's head, wiping off the debt incurred with the Service. Poley's proposal is an intimation that it is precisely Marlowe's association with Raleigh that has secured the protection of the Service even when his atheism has become notoriously public. What he knows of Raleigh has made him useful as long as there is a possibility of persuading Marlowe to give his friend away. In turning down the deal and standing by Raleigh, Marlowe welshes on the debt he owes the Service, and his life is forfeit because of it. Baines and Greene's distorted

testimony of Marlowe's unorthodoxy provide a convenient red herring to distract attention from the suspicions circumstances of the killing.

Judging from Skeres's peroration, his table companions are not the only ones that have an interest in having Marlowe out the way. The idea of a collective responsibility for his death is hinted at in the closing remark cited above, concretely in "[t]he England that killed Kit Marlowe or Marley or Merlin." There England is named as the killer, although in both the official and imaginatively recreated versions of the killing Frizer is identified as having slain the dramatist. The etymology of Frizer's forename nevertheless uncovers a connection between *Ingram* and *England* which might explain the substitution of the place for the personal name. The latter is an Old English compound made up of the ethnic term *Engel* and the noun *hramm*, meaning 'raven,' so that *Ingram* can be translated as 'Angle-raven' or 'raven of the Angles' (Pickering 2004 [1999]: 169). This means that the first element of Frizer's forename is cognate with the first element of *England*, 'land of the Angles.' The etymological link between the personal and place name would suggest that Frizer is an embodiment of Elizabethan England, particularly its more conservative forces. Marlowe's murderer therefore incarnates the strong prejudice the playwright encounters among his contemporaries on account of his homosexuality and heterodoxy, and the murder itself symbolises the reaction against him unleashed by his unconventionality.

The resurgence of name density not only casts doubt on the veracity of what *Christopher Marlowe* represents, it also points to the impossibility of ever apprehending the person behind the name. The latter is applicable to the Narrator as well, as expressed in his admission "[o]f Kit's heart I am unsure and can but suppose" [p.4]. Even his account of Marlowe's death is conjecture, since the official version that follows it is introduced by "[s]o I suppose it happened, but I suppose only" [p.267]. The implication of this is that if the Narrator, who gives out to have been Marlowe's occasional bedfellow, shies away from making any claim to have known him intimately, it is highly unlikely that anyone else can truthfully claim that they have known him either.

A good illustration of the inaccessibility of Marlowe's self is found in the exchange below, produced at the conclusion of his mission to Paris:

> 40. You, what's your name, can be with me. It will be to your credit.
> —Marlowe or Marley.
> —Real name?
> —I am what I am what I am what I [p.77].

The retort to the question caricatures the tautological reply given to Moses' asking after Jehovah's name, "I am that I am" (Exodus 3: 14). The non-informative nature of the answer, brought out by the concatenation of clauses, raises the question of to what extent a name really identifies its bearer. A name, the incident seems to indicate, is a verbal tag that helps distinguish its bearer from other individuals, but it cannot be said to be a reflection his or her personality, despite the construction its users put on it. In Marlowe's case it may be desirable to fix on one variant of the family name to ensure accurate identification, but from this it does not follow that the identity attached to the selected variant corresponds to the actual personality the bearer has. As Steane (1969: 9) points out, against the portrait of Marlowe as "a rebel, an atheist, a fiery soul whose works expressed his own heady exuberance, aspirations and despairs" there is the image of "a serious, thoughtful man, a scholar, and a writer deeply concerned with suffering and evil, morality and religion." The valedictory play on the variation shown by the family name provides a corrective to the attempt to typecast their bearer through the imposition of a single variant: *Kit Marlowe or Marley or Merlin* is a truer reflection of "a life so various, tortured and contradictory" [p.3] than the now familiar *Christopher Marlowe.*

11.7. Recapitulation

The vicissitudes undergone by *Marlowe* match those experienced by Marlowe. As he grows away from his family and the ambitions they have for him, *Marley*, the variant associated with the playwright's origins, gives way to *Marlowe*, the form he seemingly invites his acquaintances to use. Again, as the allegations of atheism fly about more thickly, *Merlin* quickly gains currency among his detractors, equally quickly becoming a byword for his irreligion. When an official enquiry into the truth of these allegations is undertaken, the connotations of atheism carried by *Merlin* begin to attach themselves to *Marlowe*, initiating a process of pejorative change, or stigmatisation. Before the enquiry the latter form is already uniformly used by the intelligence service to identify Marlowe, though signifying a loyal agent who has rendered his country faithful service. The Baines note, by contrast, is confirmation of the accusations made against him, consolidating the stigmatisation of *Marlowe* so that the name brands its bearer as a blasphemer and potential traitor whom it is expedient to do away with. The inquest findings into Marlowe's death at once fixes *Marlowe* as the standard form of his family name and identifies it with a vengeful bully boy, a reputation indissolubly linked with

the name not only for his contemporaries but for posterity as well. The standardisation of *Marlowe*, then, involves the process of its stigmatisation in that it takes place concurrently with the labelling of its bearer as an atheist.

The brief rundown just given of the twin process of the standardisation and stigmatisation of *Marlowe* on the whole countenances the conventionalist view on the relation of a name with its nominatum advanced in the *Cratylus* (see 2.1.1). If Marlowe is called *Marley* and answers to it, then *Marley* is his name. The corollary of the conventionalist stance is that, as Reeve (1999 [1998]: xiii) indicates, even after a naming convention has been established, "there is nothing to stop another name-giver from appropriating the names of the first [name-giver] and establishing new conventions for their use." If Marlowe decides to style himself *Marlowe*, then *Marlowe* is as correct a name as *Marley*, and the same holds for the convention instituted by Greene re-dubbing him *Merlin*. This points to another corollary of conventionalism, one which is not contemplated in the *Cratylus* but implicit in the notion of name density, which is the co-existence of different naming conventions for the same nominatum. Greene's practice of calling Marlowe *Merlin* exists alongside the convention followed by the Service of referring to him as *Marlowe*.

However, although the preferences for one variant over the others are motivated, the appropriacy each user sees in the form of their choice is not due to its reflecting the nature of its bearer, which, according to the Cratylean view, is the property of a correct name. Indeed, the existence of competing variants of *Marlowe* regarded without exception as appropriate would argue against the notion of intrinsically correct names. The perceived appropriacy of each variant, rather, is a result of the users assigning them a meaning which sums up the image they have of the bearer. This is more readily seen in Greene's imposition of *Merlin* as a means of advertising Marlowe's atheism. Although its use as a byword for irreligion is facilitated by the connotations of black magic and sodomy it already carries, the equation of the variant with atheism is effectuated through the byname *the atheist* appended to it. Through the co-occurrence with the noun phrase *Merlin* becomes so imbibed with the semantic content of its head that the name comes to convey the meaning 'atheist' whenever it is applied to Marlowe, even when it appears by itself. In this way, two interrelated conventions are established: a naming convention whereby *Merlin* is used for the primary identification of Marlowe, and semantic convention whereby the name connotes 'atheist' every time it is used to identify the playwright.

The eventual reduction of the variants to a single standard form suggests a tendency towards economy within the naming convention involving the family name. The existence of separate naming practices is guaranteed as long as each variant conveys a different meaning to their respective users, even though they name the same individual. Such is the case of the co-existence of *Merlin* and *Marlowe* when the latter signified 'faithful servant,' as opposed to the meaning 'atheist' communicated by the former. Yet as soon as the former meaning is ousted by the latter in *Marlowe*, this variant renders the other redundant, bringing about its disappearance as a result. The enforcement of semantic uniformity assists in the imposition of a standard form of the name so that *Christopher Marlowe* will always be used to refer to Marlowe, and always with the meaning of 'the atheist that came to grief in a tavern brawl.' Symbolically, the semantic and formal homogenisation of his family name enacts the defeat of the innovatory urge the playwright represents by the rigid categorisation of experience imposed by the forces that destroy him.

12. The Stigmatisation of the Names Borne by Marlowe's Enemies

In this chapter the survey will be extended to the naming practices applied to the characters depicted in *A Dead Man in Deptford* involved in the destruction of Marlowe's reputation or his violent and untimely end. More specifically, the analyses will centre on the names used for the primary identification of Robert Poley, Nicholas Skeres and Ingram Frizer, the characters directly responsible for the murder of Marlowe, as well as Robert Greene, the individual who first orchestrated the moral panic centred on Marlowe later seized upon by his murderers to cover up the killing. What links Poley, Skeres and Poley to Greene is their common animosity against the figure and the person of Marlowe.

As with multi-designatory *Tom* in Chapter Seven, the inclusion of the names of the characters just listed constitutes a departure from the analyses devoted to the naming of their victim. Also, from the enumeration given above it is apparent that, apart from the dual designation of *Robert*, the names enumerated do not bear any direct relation to one another, either formal or etymological or otherwise. The absence of any overt relationship between the names mentioned necessarily lends a compendious character to their analysis insomuch as the paronomasia each name is involved in enlists disparate expressions in both form and content, accentuating the impression of diversity created by an array of different names. Underlying the compendium of puns involving the names, however, there is a discernible common theme associated with the animus their respective bearers have against Marlowe. This concern with punning constitutes a return to the focus on form, connotative meaning and semantic contagion characterising the examination of *Kit* in the first part of the thesis.

Again as with multi-designatory *Tom*, the features displayed by the naming of Marlowe's enemies are important only to the extent to which they bring new perspectives to bear on the object of their enmity, another factor which lends an element of consistency to an apparently miscellaneous collection of names. The facets revealed are defined mainly through the relationships between Marlowe and the various bearers of the names to be reviewed. Like *Tom*, these names soften the associations of waywardness that have inhered in *Kit* while playing up the associations of vulnerability, the two salient character traits attributed to Marlowe by virtue of the feline conceit

which frames him. In highlighting his vulnerability at the expense of waywardness, the names identifying Marlowe's enemies take on the predatory connotations acquired by *Tom*, with the result that they are stigmatised, transformed into labels that, through their stylistic exploitation, expose the perfidy and bad faith of their bearers.

12.1. The Dual Designation of *Robert* and *Robin*

Perhaps the first task to be undertaken is that of discovering a closer connection between Greene on the one hand, and Poley, Skeres and Frizer on the other. The first intimation of such a connection is the fact that Greene and Poley are namesakes. Not only do they share the same forename, they are also apt to be called by its pet form by their respective acquaintances. Sharing the same name suggests other parallels between its two bearers, although at first sight there is not much else in common between the impoverished and somewhat dissolute scholar making a hand-to-mouth living as a literary hack and a dapper and plausible *agent provocateur* in government pay. What these parallels are starts to become apparent on examining the passages from which the following two excerpts are taken:

62. Think of the pretty child in the stable with beasts all about him. Though no geese either of Winchester or Jerusalem. It is the season of cleanly love.
    Robert Greene, staggering in, took that as a cue. Love, he cried, and charity [p.191]
63. Ah, the awakened Robin.
    Robin Poley was down, washed, combed, neat, a marvellous proper man, yawning and smiling [p.264].

The extracts describe the arrival, on separate occasions, of Greene and Poley on a scene in which Marlowe has been buttonholed by Frizer and Skeres. A comparison of the two passages, moreover, reveals them to be enactments of the tavern-brawl motif with a similar outcome: Marlowe is slashed in the wrist in the first episode, and stabbed in the eye in the second. A closer reading of the passages yields further correspondences between the two, enabling the incidents narrated in each to be interpreted within a typological frame in which the second is prefigured by the first, and the meaning of the first is revealed by the fulfilment of the second. According to this interpretation, Greene emerges as the type, and Poley anti-type, a relationship underwritten by the dual designations of *Robert* and *Robin*.

12.1.1. The Typological Relationship between Greene and Poley

What contributes to the significance of the episode from which [62] comes from is the close resemblance it bears to the fateful meeting in Deptford, whose climax is introduced by Poley's entry described in [63]. To begin with, there are the time and place in which both happenings take place: just after supper, in a place of public resort on the first occasion, the Three Tuns, and in a private victualling-house on the second, Eleanor Bull's, which in later versions of Marlowe's death is transformed into a tavern. Then there is the mood that prevails on each occasion, one of false conviviality with a scarcely concealed undercurrent of rancour which finally erupts into violence: a wounding in the one case, and a killing in the other; both by means of a dagger. Yet another similarity is the participants in each incident: Marlowe, the victim on both occasions, and Frizer and Skeres, his tormentors on the one occasion and his murderers on the other. The assault at The Three Tuns, it will be seen from the correlations cited, not only parallels but also anticipates the killing at Eleanor Bull's, making the first knifing a kind of dress rehearsal for the second.

Besides similarities, the comparison of the two episodes reveals differences as well. For instance, the order in which the actors arrive is reversed, as can be seen by the following extracts from the passages being compared:

> Kit (…) sat alone at one end of the long table at whose other end was a laughing company of stuffers and swillers. Alone though not long. Soon Ingram Frizer came in with Nicholas Skeres, making with the draught of their entrance the candles dance and with Skeres's stumble a chair rock. They were drunk, though gently, and recognised Kit, sitting on either side of him without invitation [p.189]

> Kit went where told, bearing his leathern bag. It was the room he knew, he had dined there with Tom before they embarked for Scotland. Frizer and Skeres sat together at the table, counting money. (...) Kit sat. Frizer and Skeres were already on wine. There were four cups. Without invitation Kit poured for himself [pp.253-4].

The most significant difference involves the identity of the fourth participant in each of the scenarios. Marlowe, Frizer and Skeres are present on both occasions, but Greene, the last of the four to enter the Three Tuns, is absent from Eleanor Bull's: his place is taken by his namesake, Robert Poley. The discrepancy does not detract from the interpretation of the first stabbing incident as the foreshadowing of the second. Since a type and its corresponding anti-type mirror one another, the relation between the two passages is essentially one of parallelism, which operates on the twin principle of difference and identity. In the case of the two stabbing incidents, the fourth actor constitutes the key element of difference in that they are different characters, although

their shared forename points to hidden affinities between them regarding their relationship with Marlowe, especially the latter's downfall. The dual designations of *Robert* and *Robin* are central to the typological reading of the happenings occurred at The Three Tuns and Eleanor Bull's.

The common name, be it in the form of *Robert* or *Robin*, underscores the similarity of the roles played by its bearers in each of the acts of aggression suffered by Marlowe. First, both Greene and Poley give the go-ahead to the acts of violence in which both encounters end. Thus, when Marlowe "was let leave" from the Three Tuns,

> Greene bowed him officiously to the street and followed him. He bawled:
> —Ball, Ball. Butter-cutter. And there was Ball with his dagger out. Come, Greene said, it is Christmas and we must love our enemies. Ball did not clearly understand. Cutter, Greene said, do to him what he did to you. The wrist he writeth his tragedies withal, nick only [p.192].

The ironic injunction to "love our enemies" is a coded signal for Ball to wound Marlowe with his dagger, although it needs "do to him what he did to you" —hypocritically echoing the exhortation to Christian charity "whatsoever ye would do that men should do to you, do ye even so to them" (Matthew 7: 12)— for Greene's satellite to comprehend what is really being asked of him. Poley's less elaborate signal to proceed with the killing of Marlowe is received with less trouble:

> Skeres (…) looked to Poley for approval. Poley nodded [p.266].

In both cases, then, the assaults Marlowe is victim of have been pre-arranged according to a plan thought out by each of the namesakes. The dual designation of *Robert* would seem to identify individuals that spur others on to physical violence while abstaining from it themselves.

Hypocrisy and cowardice appear to be the character traits shared by Greene and Poley. The former feigns forgiveness, and the latter friendliness; but they are both ill-disposed to, and wish to harm, the person the one is friendly to and the other forgives. However, the use of the demotic full name to refer to Poley in [63], in contrast to that of Greene's full name in [62], suggest differing manifestations of their duplicity, as well as different degrees of responsibility in the destruction of Marlowe.

12.1.2. Robin *and* Robert *as Indices to the Bearers' Character*

Demotic *Robin Poley* and non-demotic *Robert Greene* brings up the inconsistency in the naming of Marlowe's acquaintances adverted to in 9.2.1.3. The demotic full name operates as an in-group identity marker in the playhouse fraternity and, though to a

lesser extent, in the Service. Accordingly, as the Narrator claims membership to the former social milieu, Greene should be named *Robin Greene*, and Poley *Robert Poley*. The reference to Poley by the demotic full name is put down to mimicry of the naming style used for this character on the part of the Narrator. Thus, *Robin Poley* in [63] picks up and amplifies Skeres's *Robin* in the exclamation "Ah, the awakened Robin." Conversely, *Robert Greene* in [62] is attributed to the Narrator's empathy with Marlowe, which leads him to adjust his naming practices so that they reflect the protagonist's attitudes towards the people he has dealings with. The more distant full name is in this case more an index of the bad blood between two members of the same social milieu than an out-group identity marker.

Taken at face value, however, *Robin Poley* implies a more pleasing and personable character than that suggested by *Robert Greene*. The impression is borne out by the respective descriptions given of Poley and Greene when they are brought onstage for the first time. In [63] *a marvellous proper man* refers back to the introductory description of Poley because the phrase occurs there as well:

> Clean Robin appeared, a marvellous proper man, as they would say. Of Corpus? I am of Clare. He shook hands with vigour. Straw beard well trimmed, spotless cambric, silk under the slashes of the trunks, doublet well tailored, well pressed. The face cheerful, guileless even, as if he had shunted guile on to Skeres. The eyes even merry, the white smile welcoming [p.42].

The impression of amiability and informal elegance is in marked contrast to Greene's dirty and unkempt appearance:

> Kit looked on Robert Greene. He had seen him at Cambridge often enough, another profane one, drunken often, swearing much, taking his mastership at Clare College in Kit's own fourth year at Corpus Christi. He would now be thirty and looked more. His fiery beard was pointed like a steeple spire in a lake's reflection; his hair, uncut, stared to all the points of the compass rose. His teeth showed their rotting waists, his nails, much chewed by them, harboured the grease he scratched from his lousiness. His stockings were silk but foully twisted and the cloak tied at his breast but thrust over his shoulders was of the pitiful green, much spotted, of a duck's turd [p.121].

The sharp difference in aspect and bearing seemingly points to an equally sharp difference in character and demeanour in which Poley's somewhat vapid affability amplifies, and in turn is amplified by, Greene's glowering malevolence.

Being likeable does not necessarily mean genuine sympathy or trustworthiness. Indeed, on a close reading, the description of Poley will be seen to contain indices which cause the reader to suspect that the trust and confidence inspired by his equable temperament may be entirely misplaced. To begin with, there is the ambiguity of the

adverbial in *guileless even*. As the adjective phrase comes directly after [*t*]*he face cheerful*, *even* may be construed as having an additive meaning so that both phrases may be recast as [*t*]*he face guileless in addition to cheerful*. On the other hand the adverbial may be understood as having a concessive meaning, with the result that the phrases may be rendered as [*t*]*he face cheerful, and, surprisingly, guileless*. The same holds for the second mention of *even* in [*t*]*he eyes merry even*, which can consequently be rephrased as either [*i*]*n addition to a cheerful face, Poley had merry eyes* or [*t*]*he eyes were surprisingly merry*. The concessive reading of the adverbial is suggested by the context in which the description occurs, namely that Marlowe is on his first mission and has just met up with his contacts. Assuming Poley and Skeres to be experienced government agents, and knowing that espionage requires cunning and deceit, encountering a straightforward and good-humoured man will come as a surprise.

The unexpectedness of finding an engaging and apparently inoffensive fop in such circumstances is in itself good grounds to be wary of Poley. It lays his apparent artlessness open to the interpretation that it is a ruse to throw off any suspicion which may fall on him to facilitate his task of gathering intelligence. This may be read in the unreal comparative clause following *guileless even*, namely *as if he had shunted guile on to Skeres*. Superficially, the unreality lies in the impossibility in shunting a character trait like guile on to anybody else. At a deeper level, however, the comparison serves to advert to the diversionary tactic behind the contrast of the fastidious care taken by Poley in his attire and toilet with Greene's bedraggled appearance. On seeing each for the first time, one is likely to mistrust and dislike the latter and feel drawn to the former. Poley himself seems to encourage the sympathy his urbanity gains him when he dispenses Marlowe to address him as *Robin*, giving grounds to suspect that his affability is consciously cultivated. He is taken for a charming man precisely because he wants to be taken as such. Poley's charm and pleasing manner in other words is a studied pose contrived to deceive others, his insistence on being on first-name terms being part of that pose.

Since Poley's dapper appearance and suave manner is a ploy to gain other people's confidence with a view to manipulating them, Greene's slovenliness and uncouth ways is a mirror in which his namesake is reflected, morally if not physically. Greene makes no secret of his dislike of Marlowe, although he is not as honest as to the reason why he dislikes him. Despite his constant appeals to their friendship, Poley only seeks to use Marlowe for his own ends, and has no scruples in having him murdered when his so-

called friend ceases to be useful and becomes a serious embarrassment for him. In this light Greene's physical and spiritual ugliness brings out the moral squalor concealed behind the winning ways of Robin Poley.

12.1.3. Robin Poley *as a Byword for Imposture*

The co-occurrence of the pet name with terms of endearment or epithets describing positive personal traits bears testimony to the ease with which Poley enlists the sympathy and trust of those who fall into his orbit:

64. Well, we will sit, [Skeres] said, and wait for bonny sweet Robin [p.42]
65. Clean Robin will shrug but not everybody will shrug
66. And indeed Babington wrote, saying *Est exilium inter malos vivere*, it is truly exile to dwell among the wicked, and Farewell, sweet Robin, if, as I take thee, true to me [p.87]
67. And where is good Robin? [p.88]
68. Oh, I am no scholar. A picker up only. I cite bonny Robin [p.93].

On reading [64]-[68] in context, the endearments modifying *Robin* are seen to be infelicitous. In [64], [65] and [68] the infelicity is due to the user of the pet name, Skeres, whereas in the remaining two extracts it is revealed through dramatic irony. Unlike Skeres, who knows full well what kind of person Poley is, the users of *sweet Robin* and *good Robin* are unaware that Poley has been stringing them along, and pay grievously for their misplaced confidence in him. Both Skeres's mockery and the misguided trust of Poley's victims throw into relief the misapplication of the endearments, and by extension the disparity between what he appears to be and what he in fact is. Behind the façade of the loyal friend tirelessly working in the best interests of his boon companions lurks a ruthless adversary relentlessly plotting the destruction of those who confide in him.

12.1.3.1. *Skeres's Ironic Use of Endearments*

In the mouth of a vicious reprobate like Skeres *sweet* and *bonny* communicates mockery rather than affection. The tone of disdain is underscored by the collocation of the latter endearment with *Robin* in [68], resulting in the repetition of both vowel and consonant sounds so that, phonologically speaking, the phrase becomes a reduplicative like *kitticat*. The liquid consonant, the only phoneme that is not repeated, would then function as a linking element that draws the two items together so that they form a single phonological unit. The resulting compound, [ˌbɔnɪˈrɔbɪn], characterised by the

displacement of the vowel sounds to the left in the second element, disparages as well as identifies the individual it is applied to, in the manner of the typical reduplicative.

At one level, Skeres's mocking use of endearments is simple disrespect for Poley. It is an insolent response to his superior's insistence that he should be called *Robin* instead of a term of address more consonant with the social distance between them, a reaction reminiscent of Skeres's addressing Marlowe as *Mr Christopher* after being asked to call him *Christopher* instead of *Kit* (see the introduction to 10.4), only in reverse. Just as Skeres ridicules Marlowe's desire to keep distances through over-politeness, so he derides Poley's patronising chumminess through over-familiarity, though not to his face.

There is more to Skeres's mockery than mere contempt for Poley's condescension. Although in early Modern England the use of endearments such as *sweet* was an accepted form of expressing intimacy and affection between male friends (Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg 1995: 556), Skeres's habit of tacking on a term of endearment whenever he uses *Robin* without the family name insinuates effeminacy, particularly in [64], in which the pet name is modified by two endearments. The insinuation is seemingly borne out by the Narrator's description of Poley, which dwells on the great care he takes with his personal appearance, describable as dainty. The daintiness that characterises his dress and toilet, anticipated by "Clean Robin" in [65], is a trait traditionally thought of as typically feminine. Also considered as feminine is the tendency to be equivocal, an attribute Poley appears to have as well to judge by the observation "Clean Robin will shrug." This also draws attention to his devious character, and which is where the real irony of Skeres's liberal use of endearments lies. As Poley's bodyguard and messenger, he is in a position to know that his superior's civility and delicacy conceal a calculating and cold-blooded intriguer capable of sending men to the scaffold on the strength of a trumped-up charge. The sobriquet *bonny sweet Robin*, then, applies not so much to Poley as the image he projects of himself to the intended victims of his intrigues.

12.1.3.2. *The Inappropriacy of* Good Robin

The irony of Skeres's *bonny sweet Robin* hinges on the discrepancy between what is implied by the sobriquet and what is communicated of its bearer by the user. By contrast, the irony of *sweet Robin* in [66] and *good Robin* in [67] emerges from the inconsistency between what is implied by the sobriquets and what the context in which

they are used reveals about the individual they name. Whereas the reader is aware of the threat Poley poses to them, the two users are both oblivious to his treachery, a form of double-coding known as dramatic irony.

Poley's dupes are the two principals of the ill-starred enterprise known as the Babington plot, a conspiracy to replace the Protestant Queen Elizabeth with her Catholic cousin, the deposed Mary, Queen of Scots. The author of the valedictory note addressed to Poley partially reproduced in [66] is Anthony Babington, the nominal leader of the conspiracy, while the character who enquires after "good Robin" in [67] is Father Ballard, the real brains behind the plot. Poley is depicted as being instrumental not so much to uncovering as creating the conspiracy they are implicated in by making them out to be traitors bent on assassinating Elizabeth Tudor and handing her kingdom over to the Spaniards. As one "brought up in the old faith" [p.43], he is ordered to infiltrate the group, gain the confidence of its members and get them to incriminate themselves by urging them to take direct action. Until his arrival the Babington plot is little more than a talking shop for disaffected English Catholics. Poley, with a little assistance from Marlowe, succeeds in inducing the conspirators to give themselves away, using his personal charm to persuade them that he not only is "brought up in the old faith" but still practises it as well.

The poignancy of *sweet Robin* and *good Robin* on account of the users' ignorance that Poley is double-crossing them becomes all the greater on considering that the endearments are uttered at the moment of their betrayal. Babington entertains the possibility that his supposed friend may have played him false. As his farewell note indicates, the endearment *sweet* is bestowed on Poley on condition that he has indeed been true to him. If Poley has broken faith with him, the note runs on, then he will no longer be sweet Robin but "of all that walk on two feet the worst" [p.87]. In the aside that follows it, the Narrator describes Babington's alternative to *sweet Robin* as "just and to be Poley's best epitaph." In Cratylean terms Babington, though unknowingly, substitutes an appropriate name for a wholly inappropriate one. The sobriquet both gives the lie to the impression of easy-going amiability conveyed by *sweet Robin* and sums up Poley's deceitful and untrustworthy nature. The pretence exploded, both *sweet Robin* and *bonny Robin*, the latter uttered while the Babington plotters are being executed, are re-interpreted so that they are synonymous with infamy.

12.1.3.3. *The Implications of* Sweet Robin *for Marlowe*

In the light of the stigmatisation undergone by *Robin*, Skeres mocking references to Poley in [64] and [65] may be construed as warning against the deceptiveness of appearances, especially in case of contrived deceptiveness. Skeres is in effect telling Marlowe, in a roundabout way, not to be taken in by Poley's suave, offhand manner. Their superior is a dangerous man who is not to be crossed without impunity, not because he will resort to violence, but because, as Frizer puts it, he can put on Marlowe "men who strike to the very liver" [p.55]. Poley is interested not so much in browbeating the recalcitrant through threats as coaxing them after gaining their trust and confidence. If they are proof to his charm, "sweet Robin will shrug," and they will be disposed of. By the same token, Skeres's reference to him as "bonny Robin" in [68] is a tacit reinforcement of the warning given to Marlowe. A group of men who trusted Poley have just suffered a cruel and ignominious death, largely through the machinations of the man in whom they placed their trust. Poley is as capable of stringing Marlowe along and then betraying him as he did with the Babington plotters.

Since Poley eventually gives his consent to having Marlowe killed, the synonymy of *sweet Robin* with 'deceiver' is as much a prophecy as a warning. This is particularly the case of "Clean Robin" in [65]. To begin with, the name phrase is echoed by the Narrator at the beginning of the introductory description of Poley so that it may be taken as cue for the latter's entry. In repeating Skeres's appellation, the irony with which he uses it is imparted to the description *Clean Robin* introduces, at first by enhancing the impression given of Poley as an ineffectual manikin, and retrospectively by the disagreement between what the pet name connotes about its bearer and what is revealed of him. Further, the function performed by the first occurrence of *Clean Robin* as a cue links the passage in which it appears with the passage culminating in the knife attack on Marlowe, and by extension the passage rehearsing his death.

On viewing all three together, the sentence depicting Poley's entrance in Dover contains parallels with those depicting Greene's entrance at The Three Tuns and Poley's reappearance at Eleanor Bull's:

> 69. Clean Robin appeared, a marvellous proper man, as they would say [p.42]
> 62. Think of the pretty child in the stable with beasts all about him. Though no geese either of Winchester or Jerusalem. It is the season of cleanly love.
>
> Robert Greene, staggering in, took that as a cue. Love, he cried, and charity [p.191]
> 63. Ah, the awakened Robin.

> Robin Poley was down, washed, combed, neat, a marvellous proper man, yawning and smiling [p.264].

The parallels between [69] and [63] are the most noticeable in that they both refer to him with a name phrase containing *Robin*, and in that they both contain the appositional phrase *a marvellous proper man*. The second sentence in excerpt [63], moreover, constitutes a paragraph by itself, and may therefore be regarded as a condensation of the paragraph opened by [69], which pays such great attention to Poley's dress and appearance.

The parallels between the last sentence in [62] with [69] and [63], by contrast, are not as obvious. There is the derivative relationship between *Robert* and *Robin*, the action of making an entry, and the implied contrast between the well-dressed and well-groomed Poley and the dishevelled Greene. Yet if the sentence "[i]t is the season of cleanly love" is considered as well, then another connection comes to light, namely that between *Clean* and *cleanly*. Semantically, the difference between them is one of nuance: the former adjective means 'free of dirt or stains' while the latter signifies 'careful to avoid dirt.' Since it modifies *love*, *cleanly* is used in the figurative sense of 'careful not to indulge in immorality,' in contrast to the literal meaning with which its cognate is used. As *Clean* modifies *Robin*, the distinction in meaning reflects on the moral stature of the bearer of the pet name. Poley's immaculate appearance is no guarantee of integrity.

Given the nature of the activities he is engaged in, Poley can never be described as "cleanly," no matter how spruced up he is. He is deeply involved in the "dirty business of keeping clean the realm," which in his case requires the morally dubious task of befriending those targeted by the government, leading them on with false promises and assurances and finally betraying them. The Babington plot is the perfect illustration of Poley's effectiveness in his role of agent provocateur and his total lack of principles. Its sequel is also an apt illustration of his unwillingness to face up to the moral implications of his underhand dealings. The squeamishness Skeres attributes to Poley refers not so much to Poley's horror of bloodletting as his reluctance to assume responsibility for his acts. Symbolically, his obsession with cleanliness and neatness is a means of denying his deeply ingrained dishonesty and faithlessness. The sobriquet of *clean Robin* is therefore a label that identifies its bearer in terms of the moral cowardice he displays in failing to come to terms with the consequences of his actions.

The foiling of the Babington plot is the making of Poley as a government agent. His success, as he cynically confides to Marlowe, is attributable to his ability to "endue the

great mask of simulation" and indulge "in false smiling and fraternal embracing" [p.81]. In taking on Marlowe as his apprentice and accomplice in the practice of "simulation and falseness," Poley gives himself away. Having witnessed the skill with which he uses his facility to make friends to ensnare his victims, and the consequences his friendship has for them, Marlowe learns to set no store by the engaging manner of "sweet Robin Poley." Marlowe's misgivings over the dispensation "call me Robin" is traceable to his knowledge that Poley is full of deceit, and the certainty that the invitation to be on first-name terms is a means of re-establishing control over him. Less obvious is the uncanny resemblance between Poley's association with Babington and Marlowe's liaison with Thomas Walsingham: Babington is beguiled by Poley just as Marlowe is by Walsingham, and in both cases their entrancement leads to their ruin. The parallel is suggested by the epithet *clean*, which is first used to modify Walsingham's titular name in the pastoral reverie Marlowe indulges in while travelling to Dover to keep his rendezvous with Poley: "Clean Mr Thomas Walsingham sat on a knoll, piping" [p.41]. The sharing of the epithet is the first inkling of collusion between Poley and Walsingham, and retrospectively contaminates the latter with wiliness and deception that comes to be associated with the former.

12.1.4. The Moral Affinities between Greene and Poley

As seen in 12.1.1, the type and anti-type relation between the knifing incident at the Three Tuns and the Deptford affray makes Greene Poley's understudy in the tragedy they both help to unleash. The marked contrast between the namesakes in physical appearance, dress and demeanour brought out by the Narrator's description of each invites a moral comparison between the namesakes. In 12.1.2 it is suggested that Greene's slovenly appearance acts as a mirror in which Poley's moral self is reflected. Physically they are quite unlike one another, but morally they are very much alike, particularly as regards their common role as the bane of Marlowe's life. While Greene's repulsive exterior and disagreeable manner are a reliable guide to his unpleasant personality, Poley's social graces and neatness deflect attention away from his cold and calculating character. The link connecting Poley's covert scheming to Greene's overt unfriendliness is the rhyme of *Greene* with *clean*, a phonological relation that facilitates the separation of cleanliness from integrity discussed in 12.1.3.3. The rhyme of the family name with the epithet marks a new departure in the analysis of the naming of Greene and Poley, which has largely centred on the name they share. The reminder of

this section will therefore be devoted to *Greene*, concentrating on what the name reveals of the bearer's relationship with Marlowe, as well as the aspects of his personality that contrast with those of Poley's.

12.1.4.1. *Epithets Modifying* Greene

One of the features commented on regarding *Robin* and *Robin Poley* is the tendency of the names to be used with endearing epithets, indicative of the personal magnetism Poley exerts on his acquaintances. Although to a much lesser extent, *Greene* is also modified by an endearing epithet:

70. Poor Greene that lacks the gift. You stole too much from my *Tamburlaine*, a foul fault [p.147]
71. She spoke, like poor dead Greene, for the makers not the puppets [p.227].

Unlike *sweet* and *bonny*, which highlight the recipient's pleasant disposition, *poor* expresses either pity or contempt, or a combination of both. In [70] the endearment is used to convey Marlowe's contempt for Greene, as one of the most effective forms of belittling somebody is by reducing them to an object of pity (Culpeper 1995 [1994]: 358). Marlowe makes Greene's plagiarising his play out to be so contemptible as to be pitiful and therefore beneath his contempt. The note of disdain sounded by Marlowe's mock commiseration is not quite absent from [71]. The epithet expresses the conventional feeling of sorrow for the dead one is supposed to show whenever they are mentioned, as well as a pointed forbearance from raking up the past. When alive, Greene may have given abundant cause for dislike; but now that he is dead and unable to defend himself, he is no longer worth attacking.

The blend of contempt and pity conveyed by *poor* is found in the passage in which Greene appears for the last time:

> And Will of Warwickshire, that had been ever mild, now became boastful. Boastful most in the presence of the sick and sneering Greene, in his cups at the Mermaid where Tom Nashe of his goodness had bought him a fish dinner [p.213].

The contempt and pity conflated in *poor* are separated and expressed singly by the two adjectives modifying *Greene*: while *sick* calls forth sympathy for the bearer, *sneering* repels and provokes anger. This mixed response is amplified by the apposition that follows "the sick and sneering Greene." His drunkenness disgusts, yet the destitution implied by Nashe's act of charity attenuates the repulsion it causes. The subsequent account of the drubbing Greene receives in a street fight finally brings pity to the fore at the expense of contempt:

> Greene was drunk and feeble and the country muscles prevailed all too easily. Yet there was shame and a quick desisting, for Greene's sickness was pitiable [p.214].

The last that is heard of Greene before the reference to him in [71] is Nashe's poignant relation of his squalid pauper's death given, ironically enough, to William Shakespeare, the man that trounced him:

> —You know Robin Greene is dead? No, not of the plague either. A cracked heart and a burst liver, somewhat like poor Tarleton. (…) I blame myself a little. I fed him on pickled herrings and Rhenish, he drank thirstily and gorged greedily, then he collapsed in the street and was taken in by a kind cordwainer. His wife crowned him with bays or perhaps parsley, he rambled much about greatness while dying [p.225].

The absolute poverty in which Greene dies brings about a re-interpretation of the endearments added to the family name in [70] and [71]. Not only does *poor* present him as an object of pity and contempt but also describes an attribute assigned to him, namely his penury. The eduction of the primary acceptation of the adjective reinforces its use as an endearment by providing a new motive for taking pity on Greene. On top of sickness, alcoholism and failure, he has to contend with indigence as well.

The examination of [70] and [71] strongly suggests the centrality of the family name for Greene's characterisation, as opposed to the pet name in Poley's case. Not only is *Greene* the most frequently used of the three types of names he is called by, it is also the only one of the three types of name to be modified, either by *poor* or *sick* and *sneering*, the adjectives being an gloss on the endearment. The character implied by the modification of the family name is radically different from the one possessed by Poley. Greene not only lacks the easy if false congeniality which earns his namesake the sobriquet of *Clean Robin*, he is encumbered by a disagreeable character that makes him more enemies than friends. Yet his abject poverty, moral as well as material, renders him a pathetic character deserving as much compassion as well as contempt.

12.1.4.2. *Homophony in the Characterisation of Greene*

The description of Greene's personal appearance accompanying the Narrator's introduction of him, reproduced in 12.1.2, is calculated to predispose the reader against him. Greene has slandered and libelled Marlowe in publicly throwing into question his target's religious orthodoxy, calumnies that are grist to Poley's mill, first as a means of blackmailing an unruly subordinate back into line, and later as a means of making plausible the official version of the latter's death. In putting the rumour of Marlowe's atheism in circulation, Greene must also share responsibility for the playwright's final

downfall, although he is not directly implicated in the killing as his namesake is. Despite arousing antipathy by dwelling on his physical blemishes, the description nevertheless prepares the reader for the pity Greene will eventually excite via his downward slide to a miserable death in a shoemaker's hovel. The pointer to his sordid end is the homophony between *Greene*, in the opening sentence of the description "Kit looked on Robert Greene," and the nominalised adjective *green*, in the closing sentence "the cloak tied at his breast but thrust over his shoulders was of the pitiful green, much spotted, of a duck's turd."

The attenuating effect of the distance separating *Greene* from *green* is compensated for by the respective positions of the co-homophones. The occurrence of the name near the beginning of the paragraph, and the adjective near the end, makes the one among the first words to be mentioned, and the other among the last, so that on approaching the end of the paragraph the adjective refers back to its onomastic co-homophone at the beginning. In addition to this, the modification of *green* by *pitiful* anticipates "for Greene's sickness was pitiable," quoted in 12.1.4.1. Taking the formal relationship between *pitiful* and *pitiable* into consideration along with the homophony of *Greene* and *green*, and following the precedents set by *Kit* and other personal names, the family name and colour adjective may be regarded as the terms of a phonological scheme in which *Greene* is imbued with the descriptive content of *green*, mediated by that of *pitiful* and *pitiable*. As green symbolises envy, a trait which inspires both contempt and pity for those who possess it, the family name comes to signify this trait as well, identifying its bearer as an envious individual. The acquisition of the figurative meaning conveyed by its non-onomastic co-homophone and the subsequent application of that meaning to its bearer brings up the question of the appropriacy of *Greene*. If envy is revealed to be the driving force of Greene's animus against Marlowe, then *Greene* is an appropriate name for him in that it points to a salient trait of his personality which makes him at once a contemptible and pathetic character.

12.1.4.3. *The Semantic Contagion Undergone by* Greene

The role played by the homophony of *Greene* with *green* in the characterisation of the bearer of the family name is mediated by the close formal and semantic relationship between *pitiful* and *pitiable*. Not only do the two adjectives share the same stem, *pity*, they are also synonyms in that they both mean 'deserving or inspiring pity' and 'contemptible and insignificant.' On looking at the co-texts in which each adjective

occurs, one notices that the latter meaning prevails in *pitiful* while the former predominates in *pitiable*. The scatological incursion in *of a duck's turd*, the prepositional phrase post-modifying *green*, effectively disambiguates the adjective which pre-modifies it so that the negative rather than the sympathetic meaning of *pitiful* is called up. Conversely, *Greene's sickness*, the noun phrase that has *pitiable* as its predicative complement, brings out the sympathetic rather than the disapproving meaning of the adjective. In view of this, then, both pity and repulsion have a role to play in the characterisation of Greene.

On the face of it, however, neither *pitiful* nor *pitiable* is used to describe Greene, as the former adjective modifies *green*, and the latter predicates a quality of *sickness*. As a result of this, the premise that the adjectives are relevant to the characterisation of Greene appears to fall down. On the other hand the descriptive content of the two adjectives is hardly compatible, logically speaking, with the semantic content of the nouns the one modifies and the other complements. By itself the colour green does not inspire contempt, any more than an infirmity can arouse pity; rather, it is the infirm that arouse pity, and one wearing green that inspires contempt. Both *pitiful* and *pitiable* have been displaced so that each adjective describes the cause rather than the object of contempt and pity, that is, Greene's scruffiness and infirmity instead of Greene himself.

Of the two reactions Greene inspires pity is perhaps the easier to tease out from the co-text *pitiable* occurs in. To begin with, the ultimate object of pity is mentioned in the same clause as the adjective, more specifically as the pre-modifier of *sickness*, the noun *pitiable* complements. The underlying syntactic relationship between the pre-modifying *Greene's* and pre-modified *sickness* is that of a subject and its predicative complement so that *Greene's sickness* can be recast as *Greene was sick*. The conversion of the noun phrase into a clause in turn brings about the re-interpretation of the explicit predicative complement, *pitiable*, as a consequence of the educed one, *sick*. This operation can be better appreciated if the former complement is expanded into a clause introduced by the result adverbial *therefore*, and then conjoining it with the clause obtained from the noun phrase, yielding "Greene was sick, and therefore he was pitiable." By carrying out the operations just outlined, *pitiable* can be shown to be ultimately predicating a state of Greene.

Its synonym can also be shown to be in reality another quality of Greene's. As an attribute of *green*, and given the incongruity between its descriptive content and that of the nominalised adjective it pre-modifies, *pitiful* constitutes an instance of the rhetorical

device known as hypallage, or transferred epithet, which consists in transferring an adjective from the noun it really qualifies to pre-modify another connected to the former noun in some way (Cuddon 1979: 315). Looking at the clause in which the noun phrase under examination occurs,

> the cloak tied to his breast but thrust over his shoulders was of the pitiful green, much spotted, of a duck's turd,

it will be seen that *pitiful* pre-modifies *green* but qualifies *cloak*. The adjective also describes a quality belonging to the referent of the noun, namely its colour. Accordingly, in pre-modifying an adjective that qualifies *cloak*, *pitiful* qualifies the noun as well, allowing the subject complement of the above clause to be rephrased as something like "pitiful, green and much spotted, like a duck's turd."

The solution given to the semantic incongruity arising from the collocation of *pitiful* with *green* is not an entirely satisfactory one. It can be argued that by itself an item of clothing does not inspire contempt either, though in view of the sorry state of Greene's cloak it may arouse disgust. In other words, the lexical item that *pitiful* ultimately qualifies is not *cloak* but some other term. If the cloak cannot be an object of contempt, then its wearer can. Looking back at the clause extracted from the description, the wearer is referred to by *his* in the two prepositional phrases contained in the participal clause post-modifying *cloak*. The common antecedent of the possessive determiners is *Robert Greene*, near the beginning of the description, and reached by leapfrogging the co-referential personal pronouns and possessives that occur before them. *Pitiful*, then, pre-modifies *green* but ultimately qualifies *Robert Greene*.

The instance of transferred epithet just described involves two metonymical relationships. First, there is the relationship between an attribute and the object possessing it in *green* and *cloak*, and then the relationship between an item of clothing and the individual wearing it, expressed through *cloak* and *his breast*, *his shoulders*, and eventually *Robert Greene*. What merits attention about the process of tracking down the item *pitiful* is ultimately applied to is that it connects the co-homophonous *green* with *Greene*. The phonological relationship between these two terms not only assists in the resolution of the hypallage involving the nominalised colour adjective and the family name, it also provides a means of bypassing the tortuous process of identifying the item *pitiful* qualifies. Thus, on reaching the prepositional phrase *of the pitiful green*, its

complement may be read as “the pitiful Greene” by virtue of the homophony between the respective heads of the noun phrases.

The combined effect of homophony and hypallage is to provide the description of Greene’s physical appearance with a moral subtext. His lack of personal hygiene and shabby clothes bespeak not only poverty and a dissolute life but also spiritual meanness. The pitiful Greene, suggested by “the pitiful green,” is in this light an apt summing up of his character, identifying him as pathetic as well as despicable individual.

12.1.4.4. *The Stigmatisation of* Greene

Poley’s entrance into the novel is, like Greene’s, accompanied by a detailed account of both his person and his apparel, and again as with Greene’s, Poley’s physical appearance is taken to be an index of his character, though a highly misleading one. The contrast between Poley’s pulchritude and Greene’s lack of cleanliness is susceptible of being read in terms of a moral dichotomy in which the former is equated with integrity, and the latter with iniquity. However, in view of the subtle nuance between *clean* and *cleanly* on the one hand, and the rhyme of *clean* with *Greene* on the other, Poley’s immaculate exterior does not conform to the equation of cleanliness with probity. His neat habits and urbanity give an illusion of candour and uprightness so as to gain the trust and confidence of his victims, with the result that *clean*, when applied to him, symbolises duplicity instead of honest dealing. On this interpretation, Greene may be considered morally superior to Poley, though a thoroughly disagreeable character. Greene’s physical ugliness proclaims his spiritual ugliness, in stark contrast to his namesake, whose pulchritude and urbanity conceal his corrupt nature. Greene is less of a hypocrite than Poley, a distinction expressed through the respective naming practices applied to them as well as the differences in physical appearance. If the intimacy conveyed by *Robin* expresses a bogus mateyness designed to deceive, then the distance communicated by *Greene* signifies its bearer’s unfriendly and off-putting character.

Where the contrast of personality is most apparent is in the demeanour they adopt in their respective dealings with Marlowe. Unlike Poley, Greene has no interest in ingratiating himself with the dramatist with the intention of betraying him. On the contrary, he makes his dislike for Marlowe clear from the outset, and even goes so far as to have it broadcasted through the aspersions he casts on the playwright’s religious orthodoxy. Nevertheless, Greene is not entirely free from hypocrisy. Although he is on the level as far as his hostility towards Marlowe is concerned, he is not so sincere as

regards for the motives for the animosity he bears against him. The passage in which Greene is introduced and described already contains a hint of his future discord with Marlowe. The context is the phenomenal success of *1. Tamburlaine*, which Greene considers undeserved, and which stings him into passing his strictures upon the piece on the grounds that it is inconsistent with literary decorum, that is, the canons of good taste, good manners and correctness (Cuddon 1979: 535):

> All that [is enacted in *Tamburlaine*] could happen in the most fevered of nightmares is made to happen, and pathos is murdered by excess and the throat is tickled against its will to laughter. Have you not seen men dragged to the scaffold laughing? Where there is laughter and no simple causative that is harmless and wholesome, well then you may suspect an excess of the brutal. It is unworthy [p.120].

The thrust of Greene's objection is that the violence depicted in Marlowe's play is as extreme and overdone as to produce hilarity rather than horror, converting what should be a tragic scene into a comic one. This brand of "horror-comedy" (Burgess 1970: 90) is either a result of faulty stagecraft on the author's part or a blatant flouting of the prescription laid down in Aristotle's *Poetics* that the "laughable is an error or disgrace that does not involve pain or destruction" (1996: 9)[40]. From aesthetic considerations Greene then passes on to moral ones. Of the end of Marlowe's play he points out the following fault:

> here is the atheist Tamburlaine and no hint of his wrong, no chorus warning of the downfall, no hovering Christian dove bespeaking judgement ―You follow me? It is as though we are all to kneel before him and say yes yes, this is the crown of life to which we would all aspire an we were let. It is an immoral effusion [p.121].

That the hero of a tragedy should not meet his nemesis goes flat against the conventions of the genre, but that a bloodthirsty warlord should suffer no punishment for his heinous crimes and be worshipped for it goes against all standards of decency. *Tamburlaine* stands condemned on moral as well as aesthetic grounds.

The second of Greene's objections to the play is the springboard for the calumnies that result in the labelling of its author as an atheist. Tamburlaine is described as an atheist, as he is in Greene's pamphlet decrying the pernicious influence of the sequel to the play, *2. Tamburlaine* (see 11.3.2.1). On this showing Greene's diatribes against Marlowe's plays and their undeserved success are public-spirited in intent. He has recognised Marlowe to be a dangerous malcontent who has made the stage a platform

[40] Heath's translation.

for his seditious ideas, and has consequently taken it upon himself to expose him before he can work any more mischief.

From the outset, however, Greene's moralising on the impiety of *Tamburlaine* rings more than hollow. Marlowe's reply to the charge that the play is "an immoral effusion" —"[a]re you so much for morality?" — is an incisive display of Socratic irony which succeeds in putting his critic on the defensive. The jibe refers back to the brief remembrance of Greene at Cambridge contained in his unflattering blazon: "another profane one, drunken often, swearing much." It also forces its target to admit that he has not put behind him the riotous living of his misspent youth:

> —I know what you think. Here is one living with a trull whose brother is a cutpurse and who has begot a brat [p.121].

A man whose common-law wife is a prostitute and who consorts with petty criminals is hardly qualified to expatiate on the supposed immorality of Marlowe's plays.

Greene's hypocrisy becomes all the more blatant when it comes out that he has playmaking ambitions as well. Their meeting ends with Greene's avowal to "out-Tamburlaine" Marlowe, a confession that he intends to take a leaf out of Marlowe's book and write a play every bit as violent and immoral as *Tamburlaine*, only more successful than its model. It is precisely the poor reception of this play that prompts Greene to publicly denounce the atheism Marlowe supposedly propagates, a reaction which he admits to in his pamphlet:

> for that I could not make my verses jet upon the stage in tragicall buskins, everie word fylling the mouth like the fa-burden of Bowe Belle, daring God out of heaven with that atheist Tamburlan [p.145].

In the confrontation over the libels contained in the pamphlet, Marlowe puts down Greene's acrimony to the resentment caused the success of *Tamburlaine* and the failure of his own play:

> Your *Alphonsus* was poor stuff, rejected by all except the company of Stoke Newington, where it was howled off. Jealousy makes for poor writing. There is a sob of self-pity on every page. Poor Greene that lacks the gift [p.147].

The cause of the polemic Greene engages in against his more successful rival is not a laudable if strident concern for the disruptive influence exerted by the latter, but rather an mean-spirited envy aroused by Marlowe's popularity.

Envy is a state of mind associated with the colour green, an association expressed by the cliché "green with envy," synonymous with 'extremely or resentfully envious'

(Cowie et al. 1993 [1983]: 246). The root of Greene's envy is precisely resentment at Marlowe's success, and in this respect the homophony of *Greene* with the key word of the set phrase renders the family name as a label that identifies its bearer by his abiding moral shortcoming.

The stigmatisation undergone by the name aided by a reference to a physical feature of Greene's made a little after the description given of him. Before answering Marlowe's ironic "[a]re you so much for morality?" Greene is reported to have "looked suspiciously from his pig's eyes that were of a piss colour" [p.121]. The highly uncomplimentary *of a piss colour* suggests a yellowish rather than a greenish hue, but the scatological connotations of the phrase links it to *of a duck's turd*, the prepositional phrase which post-modifies *the pitiful green* towards the end of the description. The connection is assisted by the parallelism of the two clauses, as well as the reverse rhyme between *piss* and *pig's*, the animal denoted by the latter term being proverbial for its dirtiness. On the strength of this connection, then, Greene's eyes may be interpreted as being green. If this interpretation is accepted, Greene can be identified with Iago's "green-ey'd monster" (*Othello* III iii 166), the personification of jealousy. In Cratylean terms, this would make *Greene* an appropriate name in that it is revelatory of its bearer's envious nature[41].

12.2. Exploiting Naming Practices Applied to Nicholas Skeres

When Frizer claims that he "can put men on [Marlowe] that strike to the very liver" [p.55], one has the impression that he has Nicholas Skeres in mind, an identification made due to the mention of their association made when Marlowe is introduced to Walsingham's manservant:

> We were in Paris, were we not Frizer, and Frizer did not like Paris. We were waiting to spy on Poley, but Poley seemed to be there to start spying on us. And there was this dirty man with him, a cutthroat, what was his name, Frizer?
> —Nicholas Skeres.
> —An old acquaintance of Frizer's, it seems, but I do not enquire further [p.48].

The description of Skeres as "a cutthroat" in turn refers back to the unfavourable impression he makes on Marlowe when they meet for the first time at Dover:

[41] The colour symbolism is susceptible of further development. In the passage in which Marlowe attributes Greene's smear campaign to the latter's jealousy, the dramatist admonishes him by telling him that "[y]ou have a lot to learn" about how the public playhouse works [p.147]. In this context, *Greene* is an appropriate name because its non-onomastic homophone is also used to attribute lack of experience, in this case to Greene's inexperience as a playwright.

> Skeres wore with pride long dirty hair, and the hairs in his skewed nose had trapped scraps of dry mucus. The teeth conceded to a lighter colour, but not white. His slops were dirty but he had a clean-bladed dagger which he had taken from its sheath at his belt. He juggled with this in his long dirty fingers [p.41].

The misshapen, unkempt ruffian who ostentatiously plays with his dagger answers to the type of man who, as Frizer puts it, strikes to the very liver.

The suspicion that Skeres might be one of the hit men Frizer speaks of is strengthened by the threatening demeanour he adopts towards Marlowe. As Marlowe is a novice in the business of gathering intelligence, Skeres takes it upon himself to bully him into compliance by calling him "a young beginner" ignorant of the "dirty business" of "keeping clean the realm" [p.42] and dropping a broad hint as to what will befall him in the event of backsliding: "But once in the trade you will not be out of it. Clean Robin will shrug but not everybody will shrug." As with Greene, the stark contrast of Skeres's villainous aspect with Poley's dapper exterior creates the impression that the former's external appearance is a reflection of his murderous nature, an impression corroborated by his companion:

> You marvel at Nick here, I can see it in your eyes. They fear Nick, but they do not fear me. They fancy that he is all malevolence. And so he is, so he is.

Frizer's threat, Walsingham's description and Poley's assessment of his character all combine to identify Skeres as the most likely candidate to be Marlowe's future nemesis. In subsequent encounters Skeres half-playfully and half-menacingly intimates that Marlowe will someday die of a dagger thrust, giving to understand that he is the one that will deal him the final death blow. In the event, as is already known, Skeres does not actually kill Marlowe, but he is one of the accomplices who aid the murderer in the killing. Skeres's responsibility for the murder of Marlowe is reflected in the naming conventions applied to him. At first sight the naming of this character does not provide much material for the type of analysis carried out in this survey. The general pattern is to refer to by him his full name for the first mention in each of the passages he is evoked, all subsequent references being by the family name; but neither *Skeres* nor do any other of the names he is called by forms part of any overt phonological scheme. On the other hand, both his full name and the pet form derived from it undergo a process of stigmatisation, and for this reason are worth examining.

12.2.1. The Stigmatisation of Nicholas Skeres

The stigmatisation undergone by *Nicholas* is brought about in two ways. The first is by means of its bearer's namesakes, which have the peculiarity of not being people but buildings:

> 72. A bell tolled, and it was of the English church of St Nicholas. That, said Baines, is the Gevangentoren, it is their town prison [p.105]
> 72. as the plague growled still, that body was, straight after the lying verdict, interred in a grave unmarked in the churchyard of St Nicholas in Deptford [p.268].

The second instance of stigmatisation involves the full name, and is effectuated by the expedient of placing *daggerman* before it so that the negative associations of the label attach themselves to the name:

> 73. Ingram Frizer would not be much around, having, with the aid of the daggerman Nicholas Skeres, much drubbing of debtors to do in London [p.222].

What the two forms of stigmatisation have in common is that they link Skeres to Marlowe's death, though each in different ways. Whereas stigmatisation through namesakes merely connects him to the killing, stigmatisation through labelling assigns to him responsibility for it.

12.2.1.1. *Stigmatisation through Namesakes*

The consecration of the churches mentioned in [71] and [72] to the same saint, or saints bearing the same name, fosters the suspicion that the dual designation of *St Nicholas* points to further affinities between the two extracts. The most obvious connection is Marlowe himself, who finds himself in the environs of St Nicholas in Flushing in the first excerpt, and whose body is buried on the premises of St Nicholas in Deptford in the second. In the latter fragment the reference to Marlowe's burial throws into relief the funereal associations called forth in the former. Although it need not signal a funeral ceremony, the tolling of the church bell commonly conjures up the image of the laying to rest of the departed. By placing the two extracts together, [71] is interpretable as a presage of [72] revealing the relation of St Nicholas in Flushing with St Nicholas in Deptford to be that of type and anti-type.

By the same token the reference to the Gevangentoren, identified as the town prison of Flushing, anticipates Marlowe's brief incarceration in Newgate. The spell in prison is also connected to his death, although the connection is not an overt one. His imprisonment is watershed in the labelling process set in train by Greene's allegations of atheism and his association with the Service. After a prolonged disengagement from

intelligence work Marlowe is reclaimed by his masters, who take to calling him *Merlin*, the variant of his family name that has come to connote his atheism (see 11.3.2.4). As his return to government service is unlooked for, Marlowe's relationship with both his colleagues and superiors gradually worsen, eventually precipitating the decision to have him eliminated. Instrumental to both Marlowe's death and the re-establishment of his ties with the Service is Skeres. In the latter case he is the messenger bringing Marlowe the news that he is going to be bailed out and the order to report to Poley, as well as the first member of the Service to address him as *Kit Merlin*; and in the former he is the accomplice that helps Frizer to do Marlowe to death. What is of relevance here is that Skeres's forename is subsumed under the names borne by the churches related to Marlowe's death, strengthening the link between the latter's time in Newgate and his death in Deptford adumbrated by the joint references to church and prison in [71].

In each extract *St Nicholas* educes *Nicholas Skeres* and places the bearer of the personal name in each of the scenarios they allude to. Given the typological relationship between them, and given their connection with Marlowe's death, St Nicholas in Flushing and St Nicholas in Deptford may be regarded as a recondite allusion to "Frizer and [Nicholas] Skeres[42] sat together at the table, counting money" [pp.253-4], which contains the first reference to Skeres in the climactic episode of the novel. The reference, in [71], to the Gevangentoren anticipates "[t]here he saw to little surprise Nicholas Skeres" [p.175], the first mention of Skeres in the Newgate episode. The eduction of *Nicholas Skeres* in turn serves to trace the trajectory from Newgate to Deptford, owing to the presence of the bearer in both places. The eduction of the personal name also involves the transference of the connotations carried by *St Nicholas* to *Nicholas Skeres*. That the church which contains Marlowe's mortal remains bears the same name as one of the individuals present at his death indissolubly associates *Nicholas Skeres* with the playwright's demise.

The saint to whom the two churches are consecrated constitutes another link between Skeres and Marlowe, albeit a hidden one. The best known saint under the name of *Nicholas*, St Nicholas of Myra, is, among other things, the patron saint of travellers and seafarers (Pickering 2004 [1999]: 264), just as St Christopher is the patron saint of travellers. Both Skeres and Marlowe are named after saints who protect similar group of

[42] Although *Nicholas* does not occur in the sentence cited, it is understood, as the occurrence of the bearer's family name presupposes his forename.

people, although, to judge from the account of the crossing from Dover to Calais, only the former is favoured with the guardianship of his namesake:

> [Marlowe] was in Rheims, very weary and still queasy in his stomach after a rolling voyage of which he recalled best the vomiting of the passengers and Skeres's jeers at his own crying of Jesus Jesus Jesus as he gave bread and fish and wine to the tigerish waters [p.45].

The ineptness of Marlowe's patron saint might therefore be taken as an indication of his vulnerability, whereas the efficacy of Skeres's may be interpreted as self-sufficiency. The association suggested by the patronal connotations of their respective forenames is that of a guide and his benighted charge. At Newgate Skeres guides Marlowe back into the Service, guidance which eventually leads him to his death.

12.2.1.2. *Stigmatisation through Labelling*

Although Skeres's namesakes stigmatise his forename to the extent that they convert it into a byword for Marlowe's violent death, they do not suggest that he is any way culpable for the outcome of the Deptford affray. Extract [72], which comes immediately after the coroner's report, raises the possibility of foul play in the dismissive observation that it is based on a "lying verdict." The haste with which Marlowe is buried, together with his interment in an unmarked grave, might be interpreted as a cover-up for a murder. The Narrator says as much when he describes the hurried burial without the proper obsequies as "the lie of anonymity" [p.268]. Yet there is nothing in the symbolism behind *St Nicholas* that can attaint Skeres with responsibility for the death, for all the suspicions the secrecy and expedition taken with his inhumation may arouse. Strictly speaking, [72] does not refer to Marlowe's death at all, but to his subsequent burial so that [71] only prefigures his inhumation. His saintly namesakes associate him with Marlowe's death, but do not assign him any responsibility for it.

In [73] the byname that precedes *Nicholas Skeres* alters the descriptive content the name acquires through the agency of *St Nicholas* in [71] and [72]. The principle function of *the daggerman* is to facilitate the primary identification of the bearer of the name it accompanies by supplying information about his occupation that may serve to distinguish him from his namesakes. As well as assisting in his identification, the byname also labels the bearer of *Nicholas Skeres*. The compound *daggerman*, aided by its alliteration with *drubbing* and *debtors*, not only describes an individual who uses a dagger to extort money from people, it makes a moral evaluation of him as well. Violence and intimidation are Skeres's *métier*, and one would do well to steer clear

from him. As with *Merlin the atheist*, the co-occurrence of *Nicholas Skeres* with *the daggerman* results in the semantic contamination of the name so that it comes to signify 'one who uses a dagger to extort.'

A dagger is the weapon which will take Marlowe's life, which, given his reputation as a cutthroat, makes Skeres an obvious candidate for the commission of the killing. The suspicion that he is destined to kill Marlowe is corroborated by the menacing demeanour he adopts towards him no sooner than they meet, underscored by the cryptic remark about shrugging and not shrugging as the two ways of leaving the Service, later revealed to be the signal to dispatch Marlowe and the execution of the order issued through the signal (see 9.3.3). This line of interpretation puts a new construction on *the daggerman*: the byname identifies Skeres in his quasi-official capacity as a hit man as well as in his private capacity as a fraudster's bully.

In the event it is Frizer that stabs Marlowe to death, not Skeres. Nevertheless, although he does not strike the blow that ends Marlowe's life, Skeres comes across as the brains behind the killing. Even before the commission of the murder, he appears to have thought out an alibi to explain away Marlowe's violent death:

> This is by no means an execution. We three here seek only to defend ourselves against a wild man. For you are wild to leave, are you not [p.266]?

The claim that Skeres and his confederates are defending themselves "against a wild man" contains the germ of the story they tell to the jurors commissioned to investigate the killing, and that is ultimately accepted as a truthful account of the incident. He is also the one that obtains the murder weapon, "Skeres took out a dagger and slid it across the table," and hands it to Frizer to stab Marlowe with:

> Thou, dear Ingram, shalt have the privilege of the strike. You have been broody long and may now lay the egg [pp.266-7].

The invitation to give the dagger thrust has the air of the granting of a favour. As he is the daggerman, the task of dispatching Marlowe falls to Skeres; but knowing of the grudge Frizer bears against their victim, the man entrusted with the killing graciously cedes the honour to the one that will derive the most pleasure from it.

Although Frizer actually carries out the murder, Skeres is the one that masterminds it. Together with Poley, he also takes an active part in the killing, by holding one of Marlowe's arms as Frizer stabs him in the eye. On balance, then, Skeres lives up to Poley's assessment of him as being "all malevolence," although his malignancy is

shown to be compounded with Machiavellian cunning. His byname is still an apt description of him as well, although in the context of the murder the compound acquires a different meaning to the one suggested in [72]: *the daggerman* no longer signifies 'one who uses a dagger,' but 'one who supplies a dagger.' The change in meaning has a knock-on effect on *Nicholas Skeres* in that the stigmatisation it undergoes through semantic contagion from the byname now reflects the bearer's responsibility in Marlowe's murder. *Nicholas Skeres* no longer refers to a witness to the murder, the meaning the name acquired through *St Nicholas*, but an active participant in it.

12.2.2. The Stigmatisation of Nick

As with *Nicholas Skeres*, the stigmatisation of *Nick* is effectuated through two processes. The first of these is the covert homophony of the familiar name and *nick*, a term related to the bearer's stock-in-trade, the dagger, either as a noun meaning 'slight cut' or a verb meaning 'make a slight cut.' The passages in which this relationship may best be inferred are:

74. One of them appeared, clattering down the stairs. He was not Mr Robert Poley. He called himself Nick Skeres.
    (…) His slops were dirty but he had a clean-bladed dagger which he had taken from its sheathe at his belt. He juggled with this in his long dirty fingers [p.41]
75. Kit looked up into the black eyes of he had forgot his name but soon he knew it, Skeres.
    —Nick Skeres. We are a long way from Dover where we took ship that time. All for the cause, the cause.
    (...) Skeres, Kit saw, was in decent black as for mourning and was no more the dirty rogue of the feast of Dover fish. His nails were trimmed and a clean hand played with a clean dagger [p.92].

The second process of stigmatisation, as in [71] and [72], involves a namesake, which, like the homophone *nick*, needs to be educed from the co-text in which the familiar name occurs:

76. Ah, no, not old Nick. It must be someone better able to assume high rank [p.177].

In many regards, stigmatisation through covert homophony is complementary to the stigmatisation of *Nicholas Skeres* through labelling, to the degree that the negative connotations attached to *Nick* are related to the bearer's activities as a professional cutthroat. Stigmatisation through namesake focuses more on the malevolent nature attributed to Skeres, as a result of the similarity of *old Nick* to *Old Nick*, the informal name for the Devil.

12.2.2.1. *Stigmatisation through Covert Homophony*

In [74] and [75] the eduction of *nick* is triggered by the co-occurrence of its onomastic homophone and *dagger*. Because of its extremely close formal resemblance to the absent term, identical in pronunciation and practically identical in spelling, the relative proximity of *Nick* to *dagger* brings to mind the underlying meronymic relation between the noun and the non-onomastic homophone in that a nick is a consequence of the action of a dagger. The emergence of its covert homophonous relationship with *nick* enables the familiar name to be read as descriptive byname that metonymically identifies its bearer in terms of the violence he employs in his criminal activities. *Nick Skeres* may therefore be reinterpreted as *"Nick" Skeres*, that is: 'Skeres, who nicks with his dagger.'

Like *daggerman*, *Nick*, understood as a byname, identifies Skeres as Marlowe's prospective killer. The blandishing of his dagger and the veiled threats behind the enigmatic remark about shrugging and not shrugging both give Marlowe a preview of what will happen to him if he proves to be too wayward. More premonitory of his death is the dumb show Skeres performs in an apparently chance encounter during the execution of the Babington plotters: "He feigned with his dagger to strike Kit in the heart, smiling rather than grinning" [p.93]. The mime is all the more sinister because it is meant to drive home more vividly the performer's views on how declared enemies of the state should be disposed of:

> This striking off of heads and loosing by the knife of what is best kept hidden is no more to my taste than to yours. A strike to the heart should be enough, one thrust and all over and little blood.

That is, Skeres disapproves of public executions not out of any compunction for the condemned, but out of the conviction that the elimination of state enemies should remain hidden from public view so as to avoid the raising of awkward questions. In using Marlowe as the target of the mock knife thrust, Skeres gives to understand that this will be the fate awaiting him if he wavers in his allegiance to the Service, and that Skeres will be the one who will deal the "strike to the heart" in the event Marlowe reneges on his oath of loyalty. In [75], moreover, *Nick* is sandwiched between *Skeres*, which has the effect of highlighting the pet name and drawing attention to its status as a descriptive byname through the depiction of the bearer's mannerism of playing with his dagger: "His nails were trimmed and a clean hand played with a clean dagger."

The miming of the dagger blow reveals *Nick* to be a euphemism with regard to its role as description of Skeres's occupation. A thrust to the heart conveys the inflicting of a fatal wound, in contrast to the insignificance of the small cut denoted by *nick*. The downplaying of the brutality involved in the profession of hired assassin through the use of a euphemistic term to refer to it parallels the softening of the vicious nature of its practioner by calling him by his familiar name. Skeres's viciousness at this second meeting is in fact subdued by a radical change in demeanour with respect to the first encounter, "A kind arm upheld [Kit] and a kind voice said it was all enough, let us breathe fresher air at the rear of St Giles's church," as well as an equally radical change in his appearance, "Skeres, Kit now saw, was in decent black as for mourning." The switch to the kindness and neatness shown at St Giles's Fields from the surliness and filthiness at Dover is reminiscent of the sharp contrast between Poley and Greene discussed in 12.1.2, as well as that between Poley and Skeres on the latter occasion. However, as in "as if [Poley] had shunted guile on to Skeres," the unreal comparison "as for mourning" alerts the reader to the deceptiveness of appearances. Despite the sober attire and the gentleness he shows to Marlowe, the toying of the dagger is a pointed reminder that Skeres is "the dirty rogue of the feast of Dover fish" that "is all malevolence." Further, *mourning* re-evokes the funereal associations called forth by the tolling of the bell at St Nicholas in Flushing, reinforcing the presentiment of Skeres's responsibility for Marlowe's death.

Interestingly, *Nick Skeres* is the name Skeres responds to. In [74] "[h]e called himself Nick Skeres" reports his self-introduction, and in [75] the repetition and amplification of *Skeres* to *Nick Skeres* is a narrative report of Skeres echoing and expanding on Marlowe's exclamation of recognition. Judging by Poley's "[y]ou marvel at Nick here" and Frizer's "Nick Skeres here too" [p.256], *Nick* is the address style of Skeres's choice so the two instances of didactic naming are an invitation for Marlowe to address him casually as well. Unlike Poley, however, Skeres does not succeed in getting Marlowe to address him familiarly, although the invitation to do so is not meant to be taken seriously. Rather, like his subsequent desire to address him as *Kit*, Skeres's dispensation is a form of harrying Marlowe, with the assistance of the descriptive content acquired by *Nick*. The familiar name not only identifies Skeres as one who wounds and kills others with a dagger, but also as one who can strike at will.

12.2.2.2. *Stigmatisation through Namesake*

Owing to its close similarity to *Old Nick*, Poley's bantering reference to Skeres as "old Nick" in [76] likens him to the Devil. As with *Nick* and *nick*, the two appellations are linked by a relation of covert homophony between *old* and *Old*. In Poley's utterance *old* is used as the informal in-group identity marker to convey familiarity with, and affection for, the bearer of *Nick*. In the nickname for the Devil *Old* is a constituent part of the name, indicated by the use of the upper case in its initial letter, and as a result cannot be omitted without a change of bearer. Skeres may be named as *old Nick* or *Nick*, depending on the degree of affection or condescension felt by the namer, but no such choice attends the familiar reference to the Devil. Nevertheless, the evocation of the Devil through *old Nick* invites comparison between Skeres and Satan, consequently contributing to the stigmatisation of the familiar name.

The implicit likening of Skeres with the Devil is done indirectly, through a prior application of *old Nick* to Niccolò Machiavelli. In the supper party Marlowe attends when he is introduced to the playhouse fraternity, he recites part of the prologue to *The Jew of Malta*, purportedly delivered by Machiavelli:

> And Kit, in exhilaration of his dousing the bravoes, (...) spoke of Machiavelli and his *Prince* and of Simon Patricke's Englishing of Gentillet's *Contre-Machiavel* which had been his bed-book at Corpus Christi. He said:
>
> —I have lines for him. The man himself, old Nick, on the stage in black [p.23].

Its use for the primary identification of the Florentine political philosopher reveals *old Nick* to be an instance of dual designation, inducing one to suspect that Skeres and Machiavelli may have other things in common as well. This suspicion is strengthened by Marlowe's envisaging the fictionalised Machiavelli "in black," because it prefigures Skeres's sudden appearance at the execution of the Babington plotters dressed "in decent black" in [75]. What confirms the suspicion is the calculating amorality displayed by Skeres, especially in his meticulous planning of Marlowe's murder. The pragmaticism Machiavelli brings to *The Prince* resulted in this treatise on statescraft being read, and denounced, as "a compendium of cynical maxims" enabling "evil tyrants" to seize and hold to power (Bondanella 1984: xi), converting *Machiavelli* into a byname for double-dealing and unscrupulousness. In relating him to "the popular Elizabethan travesty" of Machiavelli (Burgess 1970: 88), the dual designation of *old Nick* labels Skeres as a devious schemer.

The infernal overtones of *old Nick* become patent in the immediate sequel to Marlowe's familiar reference to the stage Machiavelli. His recital of the prologue to his play prompts Thomas Kyd's objection that he "spoke that too loud about the childish toy," in reference to the line "I count religion but a childish toy" (*The Jew of Malta* Prologue 14). Kyd's scruple is corroborated by Ned Alleyn's description of the piece as "devilish lines," prompting Marlowe to exclaim: "Machiavel is no Satan." Both Alleyn's qualification and Marlowe's subsequent denial presuppose the identification of Machiavelli with the Devil, an association eased by the homophonous relation of *old Nick* with the nickname given to Satan. "Niccolò Machiavelli was "Old Nick," the Devil himself, the spirit of absolute evil," Burgess (1970: 88) maintains, a view shared with Bondanella (1984: xi): "Machiavelli's first name came to be associated with an already popular term for the devil: Old Nick[43]."

The onomastic tie that binds Skeres to Machiavelli leads to the transfer of the satanic connotations acquired by *old Nick*. First, the latter bearer is identified with the Devil on the strength of his alleged advocacy of securing power through unethical means, and then passed on to the former as an outstanding exponent of the Machiavellian art of deceit and force for the furtherance of his aims. The demonic associations of Skeres's Machiavellianism gives force to Poley's already cited account of him: "They fancy that he is all malevolence. And so he is, so he is," malevolence being the abiding trait of the Devil. This process of demonisation is assisted by Skeres's disconcerting tendency to appear suddenly and vanish again, as is the case of his cropping up at St Giles's Fields. The connection of *old Nick* with *Old Nick* adds a new facet to the stigmatisation undergone by the pet form of Skeres's forename. *Nick* adverts not only to his skill with the dagger but his malevolent nature as well.

[43] This is not altogether clear. The OED (1989 X: 391) records the earliest use of *Old Nick* dates from the seventeenth century, although it should be borne in mind that the sobriquet will have been in currency for a considerable time before it first appeared in writing, so it is not unreasonable to suppose that it was a "popular term for the devil" in the lifetime of the historical Christopher Marlowe. Neither is the origin of the appellation really known. It has been speculated that it derives from the German *Nickel*, meaning 'goblin,' later folk-etymologised as the clipped form of *Nicholas* (Weekley II 1921: 983 & Pickering 2004 [1999]: 264). An interesting theory regarding the etymology of *Old Nick* has been advanced by Leisi (1989: 53-7). According to this theory, the sobriquet is derived from *Old Iniquity*, which was identified with one of the standing roles of the morality play, normally a minor demon, and eventually becoming associated with the Devil. In time the unstressed initial and final syllables of *Iniquity* were elided and the rump form folk-etymologised as *Nick*, a process which seems to have begun in the late sixteenth century on the grounds that recorded instances of *Old Iniquity* become comparatively rare in that period, disappearing altogether after 1616.

12.2.3. Implications of the Sexual Connotations of Nick

In the way of a postscript to this section attention will now be given to the sexual undertones *Nick* acquires, with special reference to the bearing they have on the murder of Marlowe. On the whole the killing has so far been considered as the elimination of a rogue government agent who has become a severe embarrassment for his employers. In bringing the sexual associations evoked by the familiar name, a new perspective is brought to bear on the Deptford affray. There is more to the killing than the necessity to get rid of a troublesome agent who has outlived his usefulness.

The starting point for the present analysis is the eduction of the non-onomastic homophone *nick* by means of the co-occurrence of *Nick* and *dagger* in [74] and [75]. There the meronymic relation between the *dagger* and *nick* was evoked to account for the transformation of *Nick* into a label which identifies its bearer in terms of the ominous trade he plies. An account was also given of the symbolic force acquired by the dagger: Marlowe is to die from a dagger thrust, and Skeres's habit of playing with his dagger is a premonition of the dagger thrust, inextricably linking the instrument that will take his life to Marlowe's fate.

Besides a lethal weapon, the dagger is a phallic symbol as well. In early Modern English slang *knife* is used as a synonym of 'penis' (Williams 1994: 765 II), a meaning which can be extended to *dagger*, which denotes a knife used expressly as an offensive weapon. In [74] the phallic associations of the dagger are called forth by Skeres's juggling "with this in his long dirty fingers," vaguely reminiscent of masturbation. The phallic symbolism suggested by the dagger in turn triggers the sexual connotations carried by *nick*, the non-onomastic homophone of *Nick* educed by *dagger*. In early Modern English slang *nick* metaphorically signifies 'vagina,' on account of the perceived similarity between a cut and the female sexual organs (Williams 1994: 947 II). Just as in the normal, non-sexual acceptation of the terms, the relation between 'dagger' and 'nick' is a meronymic one, based on the engagement of the sexual organs during coition. Underlying the physical violence communicated by Skeres's juggling of his dagger is the threat of sexual violence, intimated by the vaguely masturbatory caressing of the blade.

With Marlowe involved, sexuality inevitably means homosexuality, and the allusion to sexual violence in turn entails homophobia. Skeres seems to be already apprised of Marlowe's sexual orientation before their meeting in Dover. Asked to explain what he means with shrugging and not shrugging, Skeres replies "[a]t a man's coming and going

and following his own desires, as they call them" [p.42]. The vagueness of the tag *as they call them* suggests that the phrase *his own desires* is a euphemistic substitute for *sodomy*, the label for "the love that dares not speak its name" (Smith 1991: 12). Both at the Tuns and Eleanor Bull's the topic of male-male love is brought up, in Frizer's admonitory "[t]here is to be no beastliness" on the first occasion (see 7.3.5), and Skeres's pointedly vulgar comparison between anal sex and the gruesome climax to Marlowe's *Edward the Second* (see 7.2.4). Finally, homosexuality is evoked the instant before Marlowe is stabbed, in the stream of invective Frizer pours out before dealing the dagger blow. The homophobic subtext inferable from Skeres and Frizer's words casts the prospective murder of Marlowe in a new light. Like King Edward, Marlowe is liquidated mainly for reasons of state, though his sexual orientation is adduced as an additional motive for wanting him dead.

12.3. Exploiting Naming Practices Applied to Ingram Frizer

Frizer is the antagonist Marlowe has the most contact with. Thomas Walsingham introduces him as "my man Frizer" [p.34], to which Frizer replies "[m]y office is to protect him I serve" [p.55]. Marlowe's future murderer is as much Walsingham's bodyguard as his personal attendant, and the observation that "Frizer had money and much of this money slid into Tom's lean purse" [p.84] suggests that he is also Walsingham's factor and unofficial moneylender. Frizer's versatility is only surpassed by his unswerving loyalty to Walsingham, acknowledged with the backhanded compliment that his servant is "highly or deeply devoted" [p.34], and eventually he is rewarded with the stewardship of the Walsingham estate when his master takes possession of it. His devotion is such that Frizer hardly ever lets his charge out of his sight except when he himself is out on business, a situation Walsingham acquiesces to on account of his servant's usefulness financially, indicated by the admission "[a] wonderfully necessary man (…) my perambulating moneybag" [p.250]. Marlowe finds Frizer's constant presence an irritating check on his affair with Walsingham, his irritation soon growing into an intense antipathy, amply returned by Frizer's resentment of his intrusion. Practically from the outset, then, Marlowe's relationship with Frizer is marked by mutual jealousy and suspicion, insidiously encouraged by the object of their rivalry. Marlowe, Frizer and Walsingham form a triangle in which the first two members vie for the attentions of the third, the one regarding the other as a bad influence on the disputed object of their desire. As explained in 4.3.3, the discord

between Marlowe and Frizer is framed in the cat-and-dog metaphor resulting from their respective feline and canine characterisations in the light of Walsingham's descriptions "Frizer is a dog and a good dog" [p.34] and "you are no dog" [p.35]. The on-and-off dogfight Marlowe and Frizer are involved in throughout the narrative provides the background to the stylistic exploitation of the naming of the latter.

If the survey of the naming of Skeres has centred on the full and end-clipped forms of his forename, then the examination of the naming of Frizer will focus on the family name. As for his forename, nothing can be added to etymological link between *Ingram* and *England* remarked on regarding "[t]he England that killed Kit Marlowe or Marley or Merlin" in 11.6, except its singularity. Singularity is a feature that *Ingram* has in common with *Kit* in that Frizer is the only character to bear the name, suggesting the entwined destinies of the killer and his victim. Unlike *Kit*, however, the singularity of *Ingram* does not signal social maladjustment. Rather, as its conflation into *England* implies, singular *Ingram* confers on its bearer the distinction of preserving Elizabethan society of the threat to its stability posed by the man he stabbed to death.

The family name is not frequently exploited for stylistic purposes either. On the whole *Frizer* is paired to other expressions on only a few occasions, in spite of the high frequency with which it occurs. None the less, the instances of phonological patterning that have emerged offer provide a useful point of ingression for the examination of Marlowe's stormy relationship with his prospective murderer. These consist basically of alliteration, namely

77. He left black in mood and ready to fist Frizer to jelly [p.58]
78. Kit had worn his sword (…) but made for Frizer with his fists [p.141]
79. Kit struck at Frizer's head but grazed his brow. Frizer spoke foully [p.266]
80. Frizer spoke very foully:
    —Filthy sodomite. Filthy buggering seducer of men and boys. Nasty Godless sneering fleering bastard [p.267].

Perhaps the most interesting of the handful phonological schemes involving the family name is the instance of apophony that occurs with the first reference to be made to its bearer:

81. I leave reading to my man Frizer.
    —Frazer?
    —He calls himself Frizer. Ingram is his other name. He is often called Mr Ingram [p.34].

The terms with which *Frizer* alliterates in [77]-[80] are connotative of violence, *fist(s)*, *foully* and *filthy*, rendering the phonological schemes they form a direct reflection of the

animosity between Marlowe and Frizer. The apophony of the two variants of *Frizer* is related more to the issue of the perception of the bearer as a threat to Marlowe, and so will be dealt with separately.

12.3.1. Alliteration Involving Frizer

As stated in the introduction to this sub-section, the instances of alliteration enumerated there betoken the violent antagonism between Marlowe and Frizer. A preliminary overview of [77]-[80] suggests that the onus for their mutual antipathy falls on the latter of the two antagonists. On comparing the four instances of alliteration, the first thing to come to notice is that one term of the alliterating pair remains constant while the other varies from doublet to doublet. The variable terms are precisely the ones that invest the phonological schemes with connotations of violence, *fist* and *fists* evoking physical violence, and *foully* verbal violence because it modifies a reporting verb. In [80] the relation of alliteration is extended to include two other terms, *filthy* and *fleering*, although these may be regarded as being semantically related to *foully* in that they intensify the odium expressed by *sodomite*, *buggering seducer of men and boys* and *bastard*. As it is the constant term of the alliterations, *Frizer* is subjected to a similar process of stigmatisation to that undergone by *Merlin*. Just as the variant of Marlowe's family name is transformed into a label signifying its bearer's atheism through its frequent co-occurrence with *atheist* (see 11.2), so, too, *Frizer* becomes synonymous with violence through the phonological bond that links the family name to expressions that connote violence. If Marlowe is labelled an atheist through by-naming, Frizer is branded as a man prone to violence through alliteration.

A closer examination of [77]-[80] compels the qualification of Frizer's violent nature implied by the phonological relationships his family name enters into. While the alliteration in [79] and [80] identifies Walsingham's servant as a man with a vituperative tongue, the instances in [77] and [78] present him as a potential victim of a physical assault. In the first of the latter two extracts *Frizer* occurs as the direct object of *fist*, and in the second of *made for*, the adverbial *with his fists* indicating how the bearer's assailant intends to harm him. In both these excerpts Marlowe is depicted as Frizer's aggressor, although the attack is only a violent daydream in the first while in the second it is frustrated. By this showing, then, Frizer is given to verbal violence only, physical violence being resorted to by Marlowe.

The distribution of verbal and physical violence to Frizer and Marlowe is more or less consonant with the account given of each in the inquest findings into the Deptford affray. There it is reported that, prior to the fight in which Marlowe lost his life, they exchanged "divers malicious words," which would correspond to the angry argument they have before Marlowe feels "ready to fist Frizer to jelly:"

> —What are you, fellow, that presume so? Kit asked with scorn under an aching sconce.
>
> —You know what I am, fellow yourself, what are you in spite of your fine bloodied clothes and your graces and airs? A boy student and no more, that better mind his books than meddle with my master that is brother to the Lord of the Manor and will inherit. So keep away from him or it will be the worse. Here he bunched a mottled fist in threat
>
> —Learn manners, mannerless lout. Raise your fist at me and you will be beaten black. By God, I will leave my bed now to do it.
>
> —Aye, aye, and Frizer retreated though bunching still, you are good at beating, we all know of you. Well, you are warned. You are no more than a drunken booby and foul bugger. And I do not speak of myself, for I can put men on to you that strike to the very liver [p.55].

The argument flares up again momentarily in [78], where Frizer's mocking "for he is a foul bugger" echoes " [y]ou are no more than a drunken booby and foul bugger." The main difference between these acrimonious exchanges and the quarrel reported in the coroner's inquisition is the motive. At Deptford the argument is supposedly sparked off by the disagreement over "the payment of the sum of pence," whereas here the cause is Frizer's disapproval of his master's affair with Marlowe. Similarly, the "malice against Ingram" ascribed to Marlowe by the coroner is easily discernible in [77] and [78]. The coroner's phrase is rendered as "black in mood" when Marlowe is described as "ready to fist Frizer to jelly," and the frustrated attack "with his fists" can be put down to him being "moved with anger against Ingram Frizer" on account of being called "a foul bugger."

On the other hand the long-running feud between Marlowe and Frizer also presents important divergences from the coroner's report in regard to the use of physical violence. Looking back at the verbal exchange reproduced above, one finds that it is not Marlowe but Frizer that resorts to physical force. While warning Marlowe to stay away from his master, Frizer "bunched a mottled fist in threat," signalling that he is ready back up his warnings with violence if they are not heeded. The threat is not an idle one, as the paragraph introducing the argument makes clear:

> The next day Kit woke alone in the *dortoir*, his sleep fellows long out and at their lectures. He found Tom Walsingham's man, Ingram Frizer, standing over him,

> chewing a straw. So it was he who had been part of a dream of being newly pummelled. Frizer was ready to pound again but desisted on seeing bruised Kit blink in the painful night [p.55].

Frizer, then, is the first to inflict violence. Further, the instances of invective depicted in [79] and [80] are a prelude to a far more appalling act of violence than belabouring a sleeping man, as the insults hurled at Marlowe are uttered the instant before Frizer thrusts the dagger into his eye. As in the incident in the dormitory, Marlowe is defenceless because at the moment of the stabbing he is being restrained by his murderer's accomplices, Skeres and Poley.

In many respects, then, the context of [77] and [78] foreshadow the Deptford affray as related by the Narrator. This bears out initial suggestion of Frizer's violent character via the alliterative relationship between his family name and the various terms denoting physical and verbal violence. However, his readiness to cause bodily harm and even to kill is concealed behind a blustering exterior that creates the impression of his bark being worse than his bite. In Frizer's case, as the climax shows, the opposite is true: he is a dog whose bite is infinitely worse than his bark.

12.3.2. The Apophony of Frizer *with* Frazer

The foregoing examination of the alliterative relationships *Frizer* enters into reveals its bearer to be an implacable enemy intent on hounding the object of his enmity until his total destruction. The exchange reproduced in [81] anticipates Frizer's ruthlessness, more specifically in the correction "[h]e calls himself Frizer," later echoed as"[h]e called himself Nick Skeres" (see 12.2.2.1). The mishearing of the name is indicative of a faulty perception of the individual bearing it: Marlowe fails to recognise the threat Frizer poses until it is too late.

The apophony between *Frizer* and *Frazer* is meant to reflect the fluid state of the early Modern English vowel system for those readers acquainted with historical linguistics. The grapheme *i* represents how the vowel sound of the stressed syllable is pronounced, and *a* reproduces how it is perceived. According to present-day spelling conventions, the regular pronunciation of *i* in a stressed open syllable followed by a non-stressed one is /aɪ/, and that of *a* [eɪ]. For a present-day reader with no grounding in historical linguistics the diphthongs are well differentiated, and for this reason may not see why there should be any difficulty in discriminating between them. At the end of the sixteenth century, when the conversation is imagined to have taken place, the *i* in *Frizer* was pronounced, according to Burgess (1992: 263), as either [eɪ] or [ʌɪ], the former

diphthong corresponding to the present-day pronunciation of *a* in Frazer[44]. In the same period the *a* in *Frazer* was pronounced [æː], the result of the raising of Middle English [aː] (Barber 1997 [1976]: 107; Burgess 1992: 264), and was on its way to becoming /ɛː/. As a Kentish man, however, and therefore a speaker of a more conservative variety of the language, Marlowe is represented as conserving Middle English /iː/ for *i*, and consequently pronouncing *Frizer* ['friːzər] instead of ['frəɪzər][45]. The rendering of /'frəɪzər/ as ['fræːzər] or ['frɛːzər] can be explained in terms of phonological substitution: Marlowe hears unfamiliar [əɪ] as the nearest equivalent that exists in his own idiolect, /æː/ or /ɛː/, which he produces on repeating the name. In order to represent these differences in pronunciation, an Elizabethan eye-dialect is contrived based on present-day spelling conventions. If in early Modern English the nearest equivalent for /əɪ / is /æː/, then the nearest equivalent for Present-Day English /aɪ/ is /eɪ/: hence the substitution of *a* for *i*.

The representation of early Modern English speech doubtlessly contributes to the verisimilitude of *A Dead Man in Deptford*. The informed reader is more likely to accept the fiction that the novel is a seventeenth-century manuscript if the characters are depicted speaking the language of the period. However, as indicated above, the interest of the accidental apophony between *Frizer* and *Frazer* is primarily on its function as an index to Marlowe's failure to take Frizer seriously. His mishearing the family name is paralleled his misjudging the character of its bearer.

To a large extent Marlowe's underestimating Frizer is induced by Walsingham's selective portrait of his manservant as a fawning dog, borne out by Frizer's own behaviour. As the antagonism between them develops, Frizer grows increasingly insolent with Marlowe but not noticeably any more dangerous. In [78] he provokes Marlowe into attacking him, in knowledge that the attack will come to nothing because he is the lobby of Scadbury and his would-be assailant outside, with Edmund Walsingham standing between them. This tendency to insult, provoke and threaten, and then hide behind somebody else leads Marlowe to say of Frizer that "he may mean harm

[44] Barber (1997 [1976]: 105-6) states that Middle English /iː/ diphthongised to /əɪ/ in the first stages of the Great Vowel Shift.

[45] In the burial register for the Parish of St Nicholas, where Marlowe was laid to rest, the family name of his slayer is entered as *Frezer* (Hotson 1925: 20). At the time of the dramatist's death the first *e* had long been identified with /iː/, which corroborates the view that the name was still pronounced by some as ['friːzər].

but he lacks the skill to do it" [p.210], although in [81], when they have not met yet, there are indications that Frizer has the makings of a formidable adversary, and that Marlowe would do well in being wary of him. Walsingham's correction of *Frazer* suggests a strong-willed individual capable of obliging others to accept him on his own terms, despite the impression of abject submissiveness he creates. This point can be appreciated more fully if "[h]e calls himself Frizer" is contrasted with "I have in my time been called Merlin"[p.27] and "Merlin is a magical name. Some call me by it" [p.111] (see 11.3.2.2). The three statements are similar to one another in that they all contain a verb of nomination and a personal name so that in each statement the personal pronouns refer to the bearer of the personal name. Thus, in the first statement *he* and *himself* refer to the bearer of *Frizer*, and *I* and *me* to the bearer of *Merlin* in the second and third statement respectively. In the first statement, however, the relation of co-reference between the subject and direct object strongly suggests that *Frizer* is the name of the bearer's choice, which is not the case in the other two statements. In the second *I* is a passive subject, and in the third *me* is not co-referential with *Someone*, indicating that *Merlin* is an external imposition on its bearer. That others, including his master, use the name of his choice to address or refer to him is a good measure of the control Frizer has over his life and acquaintances, a control which Marlowe lacks as he responds to the names others are pleased to impose on him.

Further corroboration for Frizer's strength of character is provided by the stability of his family name. With the exception of the *Frizer-Frazer* doublet, which is the result of momentary confusion over its pronunciation, Frizer's family name shows no variation whatsoever. This stability is in stark contrast to the variability displayed by *Marlowe*, causing its bearer to make the frequently ignored suggestion, via the refrain "Marlowe will do," to be called by this variant. The invariability of *Frizer*, moreover, points to other traits of the bearer's personality concealed by his subordination to Walsingham. Besides unconditional loyalty to his master, the constancy of his family name may connote Frizer's single-mindedness, especially as regards his hostility towards Marlowe. *Frizer* is as much proof against variation as Frizer is relentless towards the object of his hostility.

The image that is emerging of Frizer as a wolf in sheep's clothing is undermined somewhat by the comment "[h]e is often called Mr Ingram." As in "I have in my time been called Merlin," the passive voice indicates that *Mr Ingram* is imposed, implying that the bearer is not in complete control. In addition to this, there is the incongruity of

the co-occurrence of a politeness marker with a forename. The only other instance of such a combination is Skeres's use of *Mr Christopher* to show his disdain of Marlowe following the latter's attempts to keep distances (see 10.4.2). In this light the reported use of *Mr Ingram* reduces Frizer to a figure of fun. He is certainly the frequent butt of his master's amused contempt, but Walsingham counts as an exception and may say things about his manservant that others may not say with impunity, and in any case Walsingham's attitude towards Frizer does not differ substantially from his disposition to other people. Alternatively, the prefixing of the politeness marker before *Ingram* may be put down to mistaking the forename for a family name, as it is one of those names which can be used as both a forename and a family name (Pickering 2004 [1999]: 169). In that case, the use of *Mr* is interpretable as deference rather than contempt. The confusion over what kind of name *Ingram* is adds to the impression created by the apophony between *Frizer* and *Frazer* that its bearer is something of a dark horse. On the one hand Frizer is an object of ridicule on account of his slavish loyalty to Walsingham and his self-importance in the discharging of his duties, and on the other he is an object of awe on account of his business acumen and the single-mindedness with which he pursues his business ventures.

In spite of all the evidence, Marlowe fails to see the money-grubbing fraudster as a danger to him until its too late. For him the moment of revelation comes in the moments leading up to his death:

> Robin Poley, smiling, moved his chair to Kit's right. The limping and wincing Frizer skirred his chair along the floor to the left [p.265].

The participal adjectives *limping* and *wincing*, connotative of pain and weakness, conspire with the friendliness conveyed by the participal clause *smiling* to soften the menacing overtones the flanking movement carried out by Poley and Frizer. The pretence at being innocuous is finally dropped when Marlowe "rose, but Frizer's arm, surprisingly strong, pulled him down" [p.266]. The adverb *surprisingly* is more applicable to Marlowe than to the adjective it modifies in that it describes Marlowe's amazement at the discovery of Frizer's physical strength. Up till that instant he had seen Walsingham's manservant as an unpleasant but otherwise inoffensive individual, deluded by his limp and pusillanimity. The mistaking of *Frazer* for *Frizer* at the beginning of his acquaintance with Frizer may be regarding as symbolising Marlowe's delusion in this respect.

12.4. Recapitulation

The principle aim of the analysis undertaken in this chapter has been to account for the interpretation of the various phonological schemes of which the names examined form part as a frame for the conspiracy theory advanced by the Narrator. Throughout his chronicle Marlowe is victimised because of his sexual orientation and unwillingness to accept received beliefs uncritically, and the bearers of the names reviewed play a key role in the character assassination he endures, the extra-judicial execution carried out on him and the propagation of the black legend of the atheist and sodomite that was killed in a tavern brawl. Just as Marlowe's enemies conspire to destroy him in word and in deed, the disparate phonological relationships their names enter into come together to reinforce the image given of him as a victim of personal enmity, moral bigotry and political expediency.

The initial handicap the analysis has had to contend with has been the variegated nature of the material under discussion. The names analysed have none of the formal or semantic correspondences to each other such as those that exist, for instance, between *Kit* and *cat*, or *Kit* and *Kyd*. Nor do they have any such correspondences with any of the names used for the primary identification of Marlowe. Nevertheless, the phonological schemes these names belong to have all been shown to reflect in some way the relationships their respective bearers have with Marlowe, and the exploration of these relationships have thrown up two features common to all of them. On the one hand, there is the tension that characterises them, though in some relationships the tension is more obvious than in others. On the other hand, there is a component of deception in all the relationships Marlowe has with each of the bearers of the names reviewed, though, as with the first feature, the deception is more pronounced in some relationships than in others.

As regards the first feature to be identified, the last instance to come under examination is the barely concealed undercurrent of violence expressed through the alliteration of *Frizer* with *fist* and *foul*. The violence conveyed by this phonological scheme identifies him as Marlowe's mortal enemy. Violence also bulks large in the covert homophony of *Nick* with *nick*, elicited by the co-occurrence of the pet name with *dagger*, the noun denoting the instrument that causes Marlowe's death. Further, the sexual connotations of *dagger* and the non-onomastic homophone introduce an element of homophobia to the truculence suggested by the original meronymic relation of *dagger* with *nick*. Finally, the homophonous relation of *Greene* with *green* alludes to a

relationship based on the envy felt by the bearer of the family name for Marlowe. In all the phonological schemes just enumerated, then, dislike and the desire to harm are patently clear.

With respect to the second feature, the one-off relation of apophony with *Frazer* serves as a reminder of the truth of the adage that appearances are deceptive. For much of the novel its bearer gives the impression of not having what it takes to settle accounts with Marlowe, yet in the event it is Frizer that has the stomach to kill him in cold blood. Conversely, the transformation, through its homophony with *nick* and its demonic associations, of *old Nick* into a label that distinguishes Skeres on the basis of his malevolence and métier singles him out as Marlowe's prospective murderer. In the event, as already indicated, he leaves the task of dispatching the dramatist to Frizer. Finally, Poley's insistence on being addressed as *Robin* is part of a ploy to gain Marlowe's confidence with a view to manipulating him. As long as Marlowe is useful for the attainment of his ends, Poley keeps up the pretence of friendship; but no sooner is the dramatist played out than the man who has given out to be his friend has him killed off.

Besides the strong impression of collusion created by the tension and deception underlying the phonological relationships of their names, the characters come across as being always in control. Onomastically, this is conveyed by the fact that they are usually addressed or referred to by the names of their choice, at least by most their acquaintances. To be called by the name one styles oneself is an indication of power. Marlowe, by contrast, is invariably called *Kit* regardless of whether he wants to be or not, a sign of his comparative helplessness.

PART THREE

13. The World’s A Stage

The title to the present chapter is taken from the opening line to Jaques' Seven Ages of Man speech in *As You Like It*. In English literature it is possibly the most celebrated expression of the medieval commonplace of the *theatrum mundi*, which envisages life as a stage presentation in which each individual is at the same time an actor and a spectator, with God as the supreme spectator (Andrés Suárez 1997: 11). Accordingly, having equated the world with the stage, Jaques goes on to identify humankind with a cast of actors, the social roles they assume with the parts of a play, and the phases of their lives with the divisions of the play:

> And all the men and women merely players:
> They have their exits and their entrances;
> And one man in his time plays many parts,
> His acts being seven ages.
> (II vii 140-3).

These four parallels are all subsumed under the analogy of life as theatrical performance, which constitutes the main focus of Jacques' speech and anticipates the present-day preoccupation with identity and how it is constructed, as well as the influence of the social roles performed by each individual on its construction.

Unlike the Shakespearean themes reviewed in the introductory chapters to the first and second parts to this thesis, "What's in a name?" and "Fair is foul," there is no phrase in *A Dead Man in Deptford* that can be construed as a reference to "All the world's a stage." The nearest one comes to a allusion is found in the epilogue:

> In the comedy of *Much Ado About Nothing* I enter with Leonato and others under my own identity and not, as it should be, the guise of Balthasar to sing to ladies that they sigh no more [p.269].

Although the sentence refers to another of Shakespeare's comedies, *enter* may be regarded as a link, albeit a tenuous one, to the *theatrum mundi* conceit. The co-text in which the verb occurs invests it with the meaning with which it is used in stage directions, namely the cue for an actor to come onstage, which serves to elicit the metaphor that likens birth and death to the entrances and exits of the actors in line 141 of Jacques' speech. It is admittedly a recondite allusion; but once made, it is not hard to connect "their exits and their entrances" to an abiding tendency of Marlowe's acquaintances to appear and disappear from his view, the deictic centre of the narrative proper. They, too, can be likened to actors who are cued onstage, play their part, and then leave until they are called back on again. In the context in which the terms appear, moreover, *identity* and *guise* are both synonymous with *name*, the first

synonym referring to the Narrator's undisclosed true name, and the second to the character name *Balthasar*, the role he assumes in the play he mentions. The synonymy of *identity* with *name* is indicative of the constitutive function of naming in identity, or one's sense of self (Abercrombie et al. 2000 [1984]: 171), a function which makes for the collapsing of name into identity so that they in effect become equivalent concepts. The equivalence of name with identity established in the excerpt marks a new departure in the review of naming practices in *A Dead Man in Deptford* in that, drawing on Goffman's explicatory model of identity as "theatrical performance" (1959: 9), it will focus on the identities which names help to create and fix rather than on names themselves.

Goffman's perspective of theatrical performance, with its clear resonances of Jacques' speech, is applicable both to the structure of Burgess's novel and the presentation of its characters. The Narrator's appearance in *Much Ado About Nothing* is not the only reference he makes to his career on the boards. Indeed, the first thing he tells the Reader about himself is that he "was but a small actor and smaller play-botcher" [p.3], a disclosure which defines the double role played by the Narrator in relation to his memoir on Marlowe. "[S]mall actor" describes him as a minor character in his narrative as well as an undistinguished performer, and "smaller play-botcher" as the unconfident author of the narrative as well as an obscure playwright. As he is a playwright turned biographer, the life he writes of Marlowe bears the imprint of the script for a play, among them the staged entrances and exits of Marlowe's acquaintances mentioned above. The impression that *A Dead Man in Deptford* is as much a dramatisation as a narration of Marlowe's life is corroborated by the description of the memoir as "Kit's tragedy" [p.125]. Here *tragedy* not only makes reference to the unhappy end of the protagonist, the non-literary definition of the term: it also draws attention to the presence in the narrative of elements that allow it to be read as "an imitation of an action that is admirable, complete and possesses magnitude (…) effecting through pity and fear the purification of such emotions" (1996: 10), the Aristotelian definition of tragedy as a dramatic genre. The Narrator's life of Marlowe is therefore a kind of closet drama, "a play designed to be read rather than performed" (Cuddon 1979: 125), about a successful but controversial dramatist by an admiring but at the same time resentful journeyman who casts his recipient into the role of tragic hero.

To recapitulate, "[a]ll the world's a stage" is deducible from the narrative, suggested in part by the subject-matter of the narrative and the manner in which it is organised. As Jaques expresses it, the *theatrum mundi* conceit has a bearing on both the delineation of Marlowe's character and the structure of *A Dead Man in Deptford*. More specifically, the collapsing of dramatic into social role bears on identity, and by extension naming, and the analogy of the world with the stage on the structure of the novel. In view of the Aristotelian subordination of character to plot (1996: 12), Marlowe's identity can only be appreciated as a performance of the part he is given in the Narrator's tragic rendering of his life, which means the prior review of the structural aspect of the narrative before addressing the issue of identity and naming.

13.1. A Theatrical Perspective on Marlowe's Fictional Life

The dramaturgical expression of the *theatrum mundi* conceit is the play-within-a-play, a device which consists in embedding a theatrical performance in the play, with the result that the actors become spectators of a presentation by another set of players. This much-used technique in the drama of early Modern Europe may be discerned in the following vignette:

> So, then, I suppose it to have been. I saw Kit for the first time in London at Burbage's theatre, named aptly the Theatre, when I played Bel-Imperia in *The Spanish Tragedy*. He was on a stage stool, next to Watson, much taken by Ned Alleyn, younger than he by a year but altogether the quavering ancient as Hieronimo, Marshal of Spain [p.14].

Marlowe, the hero of "Kit's tragedy," is depicted not only as one of the spectators of a play, but also as seated at the edge of the stage so that he is in full view of the rest of the audience. This creates an impression akin to *mise en abyme*, a visual effect consisting of the reduplication of a pattern *ad infinitum* (Wales 1989: 301): the actors, including the Narrator-as-character, is watched by Marlowe, who is in turn watched by the other spectators, who are in turn shown to the Reader by the Narrator-as-author[46]. As the play being performed is *The Spanish Tragedy*, the series of Chinese boxes continues into the fictional world created by the performance in that Hieronimo's trials and tribulations are observed by the ghost of Andrea and the personification of Revenge. It is also significant that Marlowe's introduction to the playhouse fraternity should occur under the auspices of this play. In writing an account of Marlowe's life which seeks to refute

[46] One can go further and suggest that the real-life reader of *A Dead Man in Deptford* is the spectator of a fictional act of communication between the Narrator-as-author with a contemporary readership embodied in the fair or foul reader of the salutation and leave-taking.

the received version of his death, the Narrator assumes the role of the Revenge and attempts to lay Marlowe's ghost to rest by exposing those who have had a hand in his murder. Its play-within-a-play structure makes *The Spanish Tragedy* "an ironic mirror" (Nelson 1958:11) to *A Dead Man in Deptford*, both in regard to the theme of vengeance and the way the novel has been put together.

13.1.1. The Epistemological Issues of the Play-Within-A-Play

The play-within-a-play poses an epistemological puzzle concerning the relation of reality and illusion, and the difficulty in telling these two spheres apart. With respect to the inner play, the frame play constitutes the real world; but with regard to the real-life auditorium, the reality of the frame play is itself a fiction. Accordingly, in the passage quoted in the introduction to this section, Marlowe inhabits the "real world" posited in the novel while what is enacted before him is fiction; but the performance of *The Spanish Tragedy* he attends, as Marlowe himself is, is itself a fiction devised by Anthony Burgess, the real-life author of *A Dead Man in Deptford*. The creation of an imaginary reality has the effect of making the audience doubt the certainty of their own existence, causing them to ask themselves whether they are genuine spectators, or whether, like the actors onstage, they have been cast into the role of spectator for another play (Andrés Suárez 1997: 13). The conundrum is further complicated by the fact that the characters of Burgess's novel are all based on individuals whose existence is attested to by documentary evidence. The play-within-a-play raises essentially the same questions asked by the Narrator in his salutation to the Reader. Is there a difference between reality and fiction; and if there is, is it possible to distinguish the one from the other?

How these doubts are resolved depends on how the *theatrum mundi* conceit is interpreted. One reading, already implied in the introduction to this section, is that the spectacle enacted in the Great Theatre of the World is scripted by Divine Providence. God is not only the presiding spectator; he is the playwright and stage director as well (Andrés Suárez 1997: 12). The less orthodox interpretation of the conceit is that the equation of life with a play is a form of self-deception indulged in to ignore the intuited insignificance of human existence. A stage play has a structure and a formal logic, but it is a fiction none the less. By the same token the conception of an ordered cosmos invests the universe with structure and meaning, but in the final analysis it is an invention to deny the evidence provided by common sense: that the universe has no

discernible reason for existing. The different roles everyone assumes in their lives are likewise part of the general make-believe prompted by the desire to give purpose to an existence suspected to be meaningless.

These conflicting readings of the *theatrum mundi* contribute to the mood of uncertainty which pervades *A Dead Man in Deptford*. Each interpretation corresponds to the dogmatic and sceptical worldview respectively. Dogmatism espouses the theocentric and teleological reading of the conceit that underlies the play-within-a-play: there is a pre-ordained grand design; and if we are unable to discern it, it is because our understanding is too vitiated by our depraved natures to be able to. What we do know about the grand design is from what has been revealed to us, not from what we have been able to reason out for ourselves. Scepticism, by contrast, is inclined to adopt the nihilist reading: if we are unable to discern a grand design in the universe, it is probably because there is none. Revealed truths, on examination, turn out to be rationalisations to allay the metaphysical anguish caused by the suspicion of the absence of purpose in our existence. Since, as concluded in 8.2, the Narrator's question "but where's difference?" is an expression of aporia rather than a request for an answer, it is the sceptical view that seems to predominate in his memoir.

13.1.2. The Theatrum Mundi *Conceit and Narrative Structure*

In *A Dead Man in Deptford* the play-within-a-play convention is introduced in an inchoate form in the Narrator's self-deprecating reference to his *métier*. As stated in the introduction to this chapter, "small actor and smaller play-botcher" is more than an exercise in *humilitas rhetorica*, or authorial false modesty: the phrase defines both the perspective he brings to bear on the events he is about to relate and his own role in those events. His defence of Marlowe is conceived and presented as a tragedy, a drama concerned with the vicissitudes leading to the final downfall of its hero. The Narrator is not only the chronicler of Marlowe's fortunes and misfortunes but a participant in them as well, although his participation is confined to that of witness to some of the happenings to be recounted, as Marlowe's introduction to the playhouse fraternity, or that of Marlowe's occasional confidant, as evidenced in the preamble to the account of the latter's involvement in the duping of the Babington plotters:

> I do not know for sure that Kit became embroiled in these matters at the time of the entry of young Babington (…) into Walsingham's great plan. But he said that he did, at the time of his first playhouse triumph when he became drunken and talked purple untruths in the manner of the poet he was. The manner of it was, he said, this [p.81].

The Narrator's part in his chronicle as an actor is basically that of actor-spectator of the drama he presents the reader with.

His status as a spectator places the Narrator on the outer edge of the events he rehearses. The peripheral position he takes up is suggested by *small*, a synonym of which is *marginal*, which by virtue of its polysemy can mean 'situated on the exterior' as well as 'insignificant.' The adjective simultaneously describes the scant artistic worth of his work and his distance from the subject of his account, made explicit in

> that is to say on the margent of his life, though time is proving that dim eyes and dimmer wits confounded the periphery with the centre [p.3].

The comparison of the concessive clause with the report of Marlowe's attendance at the performance of *The Spanish Tragedy* reveals a reversal of roles. As the Narrator "played Bel-Imperia" in that play, and as Marlowe "was on a stage stool" during its presentation, on that far-off occasion it is the latter that was on the margent and periphery, and the former in the centre. In the tragedy he writes Marlowe is placed centre stage, in turn displacing the Narrator to the wings. The syntactic parallel between *dim eyes and dimmer wits* and *small actor and smaller play-botcher* at once conveys a belated realisation of deluded self-conceit and the disorienting effect of the play-within-a-play. The recursiveness of the spectator-spectacle motif makes both Marlowe and the Narrator actor and spectator at the same time: the Narrator contemplates Marlowe, the protagonist of his closet drama, observing his younger self playing a leading female part. In the last quotation the clause *time is proving*, in concert with the realisations of *small* and *dim* in the comparative degree in their second token appearances, suggests increasing displacement and disorientation respectively. The parallel gradations of *small* and *dim* imply that the Narrator is moving further away from the centre, and that the hindsight that comes with the passage of time does not make him more enlightened but rather more benighted. The Narrator has been disabused of his mistaken belief as to his association with Marlowe: what he thought was a special relationship has turned out to be a casual acquaintance. Yet the realisation makes him none the wiser as to how he really stood with Marlowe.

Hindsight relates the play-within-a-play convention to the recitation of an old man's personal reminiscences. Both share the same frame-and-inset structure, a frame play and an inner play in the first instance, and in the second the act of reminiscing and the events reminisced about. However, as stated in 9.2.1.3, the Narrator is not so much a

reminiscing as a speculating subject, the speculative temper of his memoir indicated by the frequent occurrence of *I suppose* in the frame, the non-factivity of the verb freeing him from the commitment to the truth of the propositional content of the clause it governs (Crystal 1991 [1980]: 133). The frequency with which the Narrator introduces his reminiscences with *I suppose* has the effect of compressing the entire relation into a single complex sentence in which narrated events of Marlowe's life are presented as the object of the Narrator's conjectures. Non-commitment to the truth value of what he narrates acts in concert with the sense of dislocation produced by the play-within-a-play to create the mood of uncertainty that pervades the narrative. If the non-factive verb frees the Narrator from responsibility for the truth of what he says about Marlowe, then the infinite regression of the spectator-spectacle motif proclaims the impossibility of ever reaching the truth of the Marlowe affair. Non-factivity and the play-within-a-play convention dovetail into each other to provide the narrative with its basic structure and pyrrhonist mind-style.

The speculative slant to the memoir is announced in the following sentence, slightly before the Narrator's self-introduction:

> I must suppose that what I suppose of his doings behind the back of my viewings is of the nature of a stout link in the chain of his being, lost to my seeing, not palpable but of necessity existent [p.3].

Here the Narrator states his intention to focus on precisely those aspects of Marlowe's life he has no direct experience of, and implies his intention to fill in the lacunae with suppositions based on inferences from what he does know about Marlowe. The interest in the hidden aspects of Marlowe's life is phrased in terms at once vaguely reminiscent of, and radically divergent from, the play-within-a-play convention. The nominalised phrase *his doings* rhymes with *my viewings*, a phonological relation paralleled by the pair formed by *his being* and *my seeing*. Rhyme and parallelism combine to foreground the heads of each phrase, alerting the reader to the nature of the Narrator's relationship with the subject of his memoir. Underlying all four phrases is a subject-verb relation that enables them to be rewritten as *he does* and *he is* on the one hand, and *I view* and *I see* on the other. The rhyme also points to an underlying semantic relation between the phonologically paired phrases. The valence of *view* and *see* as verbs of perception allows *his doings* and *his being* to be considered as their respective objects so that the rhyming phrases may be rendered as *I view him doing* and *I see him being*, identifying Marlowe and the Narrator as actor and spectator respectively, and reinforcing the play-

within-a-play structure of the novel. Also, as the pairs of phrases are connected by *behind the back of* and *lost to* respectively, both constructions work together with the verbs of perception to convey the idea that Marlowe's deeds are performed out of sight of the Narrator. This focus on what has not been witnessed gives a new twist to the play-within-a-play convention. The Narrator's attention is not directed to what is enacted onstage, so to speak, but to what is going on behind the scenes.

The shift of focus from stage to backstage explains the conjectural nature of the Narrator's account. By directing his attention to behind-the-scenes events, he waives the privilege of the comprehensive vantage point enjoyed by the theatre audience, which in any case is undermined by the endless repetition of the spectator-spectacle motif. The hypothetical nature of the memoir is intimated in the second pair of rhyming phrases, specifically in *seeing*. In addition to being a verb of perception, *see* is a verb of cognition in that it is often used to signify 'comprehend' or 'grasp' as well as 'perceive through the eyes.' As a result *lost to my seeing* can also express the Narrator's inability to wholly understand Marlowe as well as loss of visual contact. Secondly, on contrasting this pair with the first, what comes to notice is the shift from plural to non-plural. While the plural ending identifies the items from the first set as count nouns, the unmarked items from the second are non-count nouns, not singular count nouns. This can be better appreciated by replacing the verbal nouns with non-verbal synonyms, *doings* and *viewings* with *deeds* and *contacts* respectively, and *being* and *seeing* with *existence* and *apprehension*. The substitution would also establish a connection between *doings* and *being* on the one hand, and *viewings* and *seeing* on the other. As the new sets consist of a plural count noun and a non-count noun, the impression is created of progressing from particulars to the general, as occurs in inductive reasoning. The Narrator's apprehension of Marlowe is consequently understood to be drawn from the encounters he had with the playwright, and Marlowe's existence, as apprehended by the Narrator, is similarly understood to be a sum of his deeds. However, the Narrator has not witnessed the deeds that contribute to his apprehension of Marlowe, but imagined them on the basis of the impressions received in the course of his contacts with the latter. More than a spectator of what is enacted onstage the Narrator is a speculator on what is occurring offstage.

In *A Dead Man in Deptford* the play-within-a-play convention performs two functions. First, it structures the novel by providing it with a frame of reference from which to view the events narrated in the inset. Second, it sets the keynote of the

narrative by presenting the content of the inset as an object of speculation. The bias in favour of inductive reasoning can also be taken as an ideological stand. Induction would go hand in hand with scepticism in that the sceptic prefers drawing his or her own conclusions from the evidence of experience to uncritically accepting the accounts of others. Its contrary, deduction, would be allied to dogmatism, because it consists in the application of pre-established premises. In the light of this, then, the play-within-a-play as the Narrator uses it is skewed towards the nihilistic reading of the convention.

13.1.3. Framing through Intertextuality

The play-within-a-play forms part of the intertextual context of the text *A Dead Man in Deptford* purports to be. Following Fairclough (1989: 152), the intertextual context of the memoir is definable as a body of presuppositions derived from prior texts the Narrator assumes to share with the Reader. The latter's recognition of the play-within-a-play structure entails knowledge of this dramaturgical device acquired through prior acquaintance with literary texts which make use of it, among them *The Spanish Tragedy*, the play Marlowe is reported as seeing on his first visit to London. This play is just one of the numerous literary references threaded into the narrative, providing it with an interpretative frame to guide the reader's apprehension of the events recounted by the Narrator. Adapting Filmore's definition of frame (1985: 223) to the literarily allusive character of *A Dead Man in Deptford*, these intertextual frames constitute coherent schematisations of previous reading experience and knowledge of literary works and conventions that enable the informed reader to identify parallels between the antecedent texts and the episodes in which these texts are evoked. Consequently, the greater the number of sources recognised, the more the reading of the Narrator's life of Marlowe will be conditioned by its intertextual frame.

Filmore (1985: 232) states that interpretative frames operate in one of two ways: invocation, or making sense of a text segment by situating its content in a context which is known independently of the text; and evocation, or the eduction of a frame by linguistic form or schema conventionally associated with that frame. The eduction of the absent term of a phonological relation in some of the instances of paronomasia examined in the first part of this thesis may be regarded as cases of invocation and evocation. Accordingly, the covert homophony between the first syllable of *Deptford* and *debt* seen in 3.2.3 is an example of invocation, whereas the feline frame of "a world of toms like a night roof top" [p.35] is evoked by *toms* and *night roof top* in. In like

manner an intertextual frame may be either invoked or evoked by the appropriation of a fragment from a literary work. Whether the frame is invoked or evoked depends on the degree to which the appropriated text is assimilated into the host text: if it is completely assimilated, the frame is said to be invoked; if it is not, then the frame is evoked. Accordingly, a direct quotation from the work or the mention of its title or the name of its main character will suffice to evoke the frame, whereas a recondite allusion invokes it.

The less assimilated appropriations, then, serve to evoke an intertextual frame to prime the interpretation of the passages which incorporate them. Such fragments, invariably lifted from Christopher Marlowe's plays and poems, appear in italic script and archaic spelling, form paragraphs by themselves, and are often preceded by some prefatory remark regarding their provenance, all of which accentuates their foreignness. A good example of the evocation of an intertextual frame is the inclusion of relatively lengthy extracts from *Edward II* in the following passage:

> Here after supper Tom Walsingham and Kit had been enacting part of the tragedy of Edward II, near-finished, with much frolicking and embracing. Tom, being Lord of the Manor, must enact the King with
>
> *What, Gaveston, welcome, kisse not my hande,*
> *Embrace me, Gaveston, as I do thee.*
> *Why shouldst thou kneel? Knowst thou not who I am?*
> *Thy friende, thyselfe, another Gaveston.*
> *Not Hylas was more mourn'd of Hercules*
> *Than thou hast bene of me since thy exile.*
>
> And here is Kit in reply:
>
> *And since I went from hence, no soule in helle*
> *Hath felt more torment than*
>
> Here Ingram Frizer came in to the supper room, still in his riding gear, anxious to speak, but Kit cried:
> —This is for you.
>
> *You shall not neede to give instructions.*
> *'Tis not the first time I have kill'd a man.*
> *I learn'd in Naples how to poison floures,*
> *To strangle with a lawne thrust through the throate,*
> *To pierce the windpipe with a needle's poynte* – [pp.199-200]

The first two extracts, from the first dialogue between the King and his minion in the play (*Edward II* I i 140-47), frame Marlowe's renewed relationship with Walsingham. Just as Edward recalls Gaveston from exile so that they can resume their romance, so Walsingham has appointed Marlowe his resident poet after a long separation, an

appointment which eventually leads to the rekindling of their former sexual passion. Frizer's entry prompts Marlowe to recite the speech in which Lightborn presents his credentials as a hired assassin (V iv 27-36), again providing an intertextual frame for their relationship. However, whereas the first frame more or less reflects Marlowe's relationship with Walsingham at this stage of the narrative, the second has a premonitory tone in that the speech by Edward's prospective murderer announces Marlowe's eventual murder at Frizer's hands. The intimation of Marlowe's violent death conveyed by Lightborn's enumeration of murderous skills is assisted by the temporal phrase *after supper*, as the time the rehearsal takes place is the same as that in which Frizer stabs Marlowe to death. As well as paralleling the homosexual romance between a patron and his client, the citations act as a premonition of the latter's death, identifying his sexual orientation as one of the motives behind the killing.

The manner in which Marlowe is killed is also framed and prefigured by the gruesome manner in which Edward is put to death. According to the common reading of the murder scene (Levin 1961: 124; Steane 1965: 220; Weil 1977: 169; Cunningham 1990: 214; Smith 1991: 220)[47], the King is done away with by inserting a red-hot spit into his rectum, alluded to in Thomas Kyd's fugitive erotic daydream, "he relished the fancied scream as the punitive rod of flesh struck home" [p.19], and referred to in Nicholas's Skeres's observation on the means by which Edward's death is effected, "to have a hard rod thrust into the nether orifice (...) was a most painful punishment you had for the King in your play" [p.257] (see 7.2.4). The transformation of an erect penis into a red-hot penetrating the anus, facilitated by the common designation of *rod*, is in turn transformed into the image of dagger piercing the eye, the climax to the *dénouement* to *A Dead Man in Deptford*. The conflation of anal penetration, and its punitory travesty, into stabbing Marlowe in the eye is aided by the sexual connotations carried by *knife*, of which *dagger* is a hyponym, and *eye*. As remarked in 12.2.3, the dagger is a phallic symbol while the eye is associated with the vagina in early Modern English bawdy (Williams 1994: 453-4 I), on account of "the shape, the garniture of the hair, and the

[47] Other Marlovian scholars (Normand 2000: 190-91; Chedgzoy 2004: 258) point out that Lightborn orders his accomplices to get him a "table and a feather-bed" as well as "a spit, and let it be red-hot" (*Edward II* V v 32; 35), and that prior to the King's murder they are told to "[r]un for the table" and "lay the table down, and stamp on it,/But not too hard, lest that you bruise his body" (V v 112; 114-15), giving to understand that the ensuing stage direction, "KING EDWARD *is murdered*, is to be read that he is crushed to death. Judging by the remark Marlowe is reported as saying, that he was asked to "cut out the buggering of King Edward with a branding iron" [p.207], Burgess is aware of the omission of the spit in the murder scene, and has contrived a means of getting round it so as to explain Skeres's commendation of the appositeness of "the end of the king that loved Gaveston's arse better than his own realm" [p.201].

tendency of both organs to become suffused with water" (Partridge 1968 [1947]: 102). Given the homophobic overtones of the murder of Edward, carried into the murder of Marlowe, the tenor of the ocular metaphor is altered so that the stabbing mimics anal rather than vaginal sex. On the basis of these considerations, Kyd's allusion, and Skeres's reference, to the killing of Edward both frames and portends Marlowe's death at Deptford Strand.

The discussion in the foregoing paragraph demonstrates that references to antecedent texts serve to draw attention to correspondences between the literary works referred to and the passages in which they are mentioned as much as citations do. Both references and citations are easy to detect for the reader well acquainted with the source texts. More difficult to detect are those appropriations which echo segments from other texts, owing to the higher degree of their assimilation into the host text. For instance, "[y]ou wear Sir Francis's money on your back" [p.68] parallels "[h]e wears a lord's revenue on his back" (*Edward II* I iv 406), statements whose predicates respectively refer to "Kit was dressed in purple and primrose and a shirt with cobweb collar" [p.67] and Gaveston's "short Italian hooded cloak,/Larded with pearl" (*Edward II* I iv 415-6). Once the source is recognised, the allusion to the speech in which the younger Mortimer gives vent to his resentment at Gaveston's ostentation of royal favour likewise acts as an intertextual frame through which to view Marlowe. Like Edward's favourite, although on a smaller scale, Marlowe is a parvenu: a "university youngster on the make" [p.32], as Walsingham puts it, whose lordly airs provoke the animosity of most of his acquaintances, particularly his nemesis Frizer. Like Gaveston, too, Marlowe eventually pays the penalty for his presumption: the minion is summarily executed by the peers he slighted after being captured in battle, and the dramatist is done to death by his rival in Walsingham's affections after being questioned about his alleged atheism.

The above overview of the framing function of *Edward II*, it will be noticed, presents some inconsistency in its application to the characterisation of Marlowe. His love of finery identifies him with Gaveston while the copulatory image of the stab in the eye shares with the insertion of the spit into the anus identifies him with Edward. In the rehearsal of the play, moreover, Marlowe starts in the part of Gaveston but ends in that of Edward when Frizer appears on the scene, a change of role expressed the conflation of King into favourite in "[t]hy friend, thyself, another Gaveston!" from Edward's speech of welcome. The discrepancy may be resolved by regarding the each of the

characters Marlowe is identified with as embodying a facet of his relationship with Walsingham. Whereas the minion defines Marlowe socially as the homosexual parasite on lives on his patron-lover's bounty, the King defines him emotionally as the smitten lover who forsakes everything to dote on his beloved: both pay the penalty for their respective follies, casting Marlowe into the role of victim. The collapsing of the two roles leads to the recasting of Walsingham into a new role determined by his relationship with Frizer, identified with Edward's assassin. Lightborn murders the King on Mortimer's orders, indicating the same master-servant relation underlying Walsingham's association with Frizer, and identifying Walsingham with Mortimer, the leading Machiavell of *Edward II*. To some extent Edward's self-description as "another Gaveston" suggests that Walsingham may also be identified with the minion insomuch as the character defines him emotionally as the complaisant but heartless *femme fatale* who manipulates Marlowe's feelings to dominate him. The role shifts Marlowe and Walsingham undergo with the application of the intertextual frame provided by *Edward II* testifies to the flexibility of such frames with respect to the texts they evoke. Intertextual frames seem to operate on a similar principle to the one Leech establishes for parallelism, namely the possession of elements of identity and elements of difference by the parallel structures (see 3.1.2). An inevitable consequence of the incorporation of an element appropriated through the invocation or evocation of the source text is its adjustment to the rhetorical aims of the host text. The character and fate of both Gaveston and Edward are germane to the construction of Marlowe's fictional identity in *A Dead Man in Deptford*, which has led to the collapsing of these two roles into one another in order to facilitate the task of constructing that identity.

The framing function performed by the evocations and invocations of *Edward II* has revealed that appropriations of antecedent texts can involve reworking them as well. In combining Gaveston and Edward, Marlowe transforms the King's favourite from a cold and manipulative upstart who finally overreaches himself to a doting and malleable lover condemned to suffer for his misplaced trust. Walsingham's exchanging the role of Edward for that of Mortimer constitutes a more marked departure in that it completely alters the course of the play which acts as a concealed sub-plot to the triangle he forms with Marlowe and Frizer. In Walsingham's interpretation of the role the *fainéant* king gives way to the ruthless magnate who engineers his downfall, instead of the more dignified figure of the man of sorrows Edward evolves into at the end of the play. It is thanks to these alterations that Walsingham-Edward is able to escape the tragic fate the

King suffers in the antecedent text and foists it on Marlowe-Gaveston[48]. This change in the script is announced in Edward's recognition of Gaveston as his alter ego on reading it in the context of Walsingham's future connivance, if not complicity, in Marlowe's death. According to this ironic reading, then, the elision of Edward into Gaveston is limited to a handing over of the role of victim from the King to his favourite, leaving the latter to suffer the consequences of Mortimer's ambition as well as the animosity of the barons.

13.2. Identity, Role and Performance

While evoking the extended theatrical metaphor from *As You Like It*, the Narrator's reference to his appearance in *Much Ado About Nothing* brings a different perspective to bear on the question of the relation of role with identity implicitly raised by Jacques' speech. Although distorted by caricature, the procession of types which make up the bulk of the speech are recognisably personifications of male social or situational roles, a role definable as a body of expectations concerning the attributes and behaviour displayed by the individual by virtue of the socially defined position he or she occupies (Abercrombie et al. 2000 [1984]: 301). Accordingly,

> Last scene of all,
> That ends this strange eventful history,
> Is second childishness and mere oblivion,
> Sans teeth, sans eyes, sans taste, sans everything
> (*As You Like It* II vii 163-66)

explicitly attribute loss of one's faculties and physical decrepitude to the old man, and implicitly establish irresponsibility, absent-mindedness and dependence on others as the traits which define his behaviour. Jacques' conflation social into dramatic role stresses the relevance of role as a constitutive element of identity, adumbrating Butler's conception of identity as performance (1990: 25). Just as the actor develops the histrionic personality (Levine 1986: 139) of the character he personates through his performance onstage, so the self constructs an identity through the behaviour prescribed by the social role he or she has assumed. On the other hand, the distinction between actor and character drawn by the parallelism between *under my own identity* and [*under*] *the guise of Balthasar* seems to countenance a dissociation of social identity

[48] Walsingham-Mortimer and Frizer-Lightborn also elude the fates of their literary analogues: Lightborn is stabbed to death after dispatching Edward, and Mortimer is executed on the ascension of the murdered king's son.

from private self reminiscent of the separation of name from nominatum in Juliet's soliloquy (see 2.1.3). Support for this impression is apparently found in the Narrator's choice of *guise* to refer to the character he plays insomuch as the term recalls the clothing metaphor Juliet applies to her lover's name, likening the part of Balthasar to a garment which is donned and doffed at the beginning and end of each performance. However, the metaphor is not applicable to *identity*, the contextual antonym of *guise* insomuch as the former term relates to the Narrator's self. A guise, or dramatic persona, presupposes the existence of the true but concealed identity of the actor who projects it, which, unlike the dramatic persona, cannot be put on or taken off. The opposition between *identity* and *guise*, then, seems to express what might be termed identity as essence, the belief in the existence of a fixed and stable self behind the multitude of personae he or she adopts. To the audience the person who comes onstage appears to be Balthasar, but in fact he is the Narrator. The opposition also serves as a reminder of the theoretical nature of the dissociation of identity from self, in much the same way the subjunctive mood in Juliet's formulation of the arbitrariness principle bears testimony to the *de facto* inseparability of the name from its nominatum. Yet, in the light of performative reading of identity suggested by Jacques' rendering of the *theatrum mundi* conceit, the blurring of the distinction between the Narrator's identity and his dramatic persona brought about by the unintentional substitution of his name for the *Balthasar* calls into question the model of identity premised on the notion of a fixed and stable inherent self suggested by the contextual antonymy of *identity* with *guise*. If identity is as much the result of putting on a performance as the histrionic personality is, what might be termed identity as performance (Munson Deats 1997: 126), then the identity concealed behind the part of Balthasar is a composite of the various guises adopted by the Narrator in his life offstage, with the result that the substitution of his name for *Balthasar* represents not so much a blurring as an equating of identity with role. Being and appearing to be are therefore not two different though simultaneous states, but the same state. One is what one appears to be, at least as long as the performance maintaining an appearance lasts. The breakdown of the distinction is reminiscent of the challenge to binarism presented in the Narrator's salutation (see 8.2), which provides the formula with which to state the problem of personal identity: identity or guise, but where's difference?

13.2.1. Assumed Names and Identities

First and foremost the relation of *identity* and *guise* highlights the distinction between personal and assumed name, and by extension true and assumed identity. "In playing a part [in a dramatic piece]," writes Room (1989: 21), "an actor will also [sic] assume not only the identity and character of another person, but also the name of that person." What is meant to be a definition of personation, playing the part of a dramatic character, is in fact a description of impersonation, assuming the identity of another person. An actor does not assume the name or identity of another person, but the name and identity of a fictional character. As a result of the confusion arising from mistaking person for dramatic persona, Room inadvertently introduces a category of name not dealt with so far, that of assumed names. These, also known as pseudonyms, differ from character names, definable as names which identify dramatic roles[49], in that they are names which provide an alternative identity to the individual's official name. Accordingly, *Jaques*, *Leonato* and *Balthasar* name characters from two of Shakespeare's comedies, and not, as Room misleadingly gives to understand, supplant the identities of real-life individuals. Also, although assumed names are taken to conceal a true identity (Nuessel 1992: 17), adopting one is not invariably equivalent to impersonation either, as the assumed name need not be taken from another person, at least not knowingly. Impersonation is a crime consisting of the usurpation of another person's name and identity for illegal purposes (Nuessel 1992: 26). Nevertheless, given that the Narrator's memoir concentrates as much on Marlowe the spy as the dramatist, the mistaking of impersonation for personation turns out to be germane to the issue of assumed identity in *A Dead Man in Deptford*. Among the reasons for assuming or changing a name instanced by Room[50] (1989: 6-20), and synthesised by Nuessel (1992: 18), the need to avoid detection is mentioned, and one activity in which the concealment of identity is a necessity is espionage. Marlowe's double career as playwright and spy extends the *theatrum mundi* conceit to the world of intelligence work, described by the novelist

[49] The term *character name* will be restricted to the names of the characters of the literary works referred to in *A Dead Man in Deptford*, reserving, as has been the practice in this thesis, *personal name* for the characters depicted in the novel.

[50] Having mentioned name change, it may be convenient to differentiate this operation from assuming a name. A change of name constitutes an instance of performative naming whereby the birth name is given up for a new identity, whereas the assumption of a name does not involve forgoing the birth name, resulting in two co-existing naming conventions. In the novel there is only one allusion to name change, Marlowe's throwaway remark "I am no lover of the turncoat Paul or Saul" [p.194] in reference to the spiritual rebirth undergone by the Apostle following the vision he experiences on the road to Damascus (Acts 9).

John Le Carré as the "secret theatre" (quoted in Nicholl 1992: 113), through the assimilation of impersonation into personation.

The parallels between the actor playing a part in a play and the spy adopting a cover to avoid detection are adverted to throughout the narrative. Perhaps the most explicit reference to this correspondence is made by Robert Poley, in the directive

> Dear Kit, (...) now is the time for you to endue the great mask of simulation. I am born Catholic and am believed to practise the faith, for me there is nothing hard in false smiling and embracing, but it is what you must learn. Faunt said something of your writing plays, so simulation and falseness you will know something of [p.81].

In the context in which the instructions are given, just before Poley and Marlowe infiltrate the Babington plotters, *the mask of simulation* refers primarily to the cover Marlowe is to assume, that of a recent convert to Catholicism. The reference to writing plays educes *persona*, Latin for acting mask (Cuddon 1979: 501; Griffiths 1987 [1973]: 176) and by extension character in a drama (Wales 1989: 348). Marlowe is to feign Catholicism by adopting the persona of the zealous convert, just as an actor feigns the emotions of the character he personates. As he is instructed to impersonate rather than personate a Catholic convert, to induce the plotters to believe rather than pretend to believe that he is one, the dramaturgical meaning of *persona* gives way to the sociological meaning of the term, namely the front presented by the self through the behaviour displayed to a particular audience on a particular kind of occasion (Morgan et al. 1979: 4). Persona, in other words, may be defined as a performed role, realised through the interpretation of the individual who plays it and the impression the interpretation creates on the audience it is directed at. Accordingly, the extravagance of Marlowe's feigned commendation of the enterprise he is ostensibly embarked on, "[T]he Holy Trinity shower blessing on it" [p.82], is part of the interpretation of the role of convert he acts out in the presence of the plotters.

In view of Room's statement that acting involves assuming a name as well as an identity, the analogy between acting and working undercover would also have to include the assumption of a cover name, the assumed name adopted by an agent when embarking on an operation (Room 1989: 11). The exchange

> You, what's your name, can be with me. It will be to your credit.
> —Marlowe or Marley.
> —Real name [p.77]?

suggests that the use of a code name is standard procedure among the agents in Francis Walsingham's service. On receiving two variants of the family name in response to the

default vocative, Marlowe's contact in Paris is under the impression that one of by-forms is a cover name, and the other the real one. As it happens, however, there are only two instances of assumed names in *A Dead Man in Deptford*: *Captain Fortescue*, the name John Ballard goes under to escape detection by the authorities, and *Martin Marprelate*, alias John Penry, an old schoolfellow of Marlowe's turned censor of the Anglican episcopacy. Although simulation and falseness are both the staple of Marlowe's career as a spy, they involve what Weil (1977: 24), in reference to *The Jew of Malta*, terms "deliberate counterfeit profession," and not putting on a fake identity and assuming a false name. Both Marlowe and Poley are known to the Babington plotters by their real names, the latter being taken in by their respective personae of Catholic convert and born Catholic. Like the Narrator in *As You Like It*, Marlowe and Poley perform under their own identities, and not under the guise of an assumed name.

Another type of assumed name is a pen name, the name under which a writer publishes his or her work. The only name in the novel that can be considered as such is *Martin Marprelate*, as Penry attacks the Anglican hierarchy by publishing ribald, virulently anti-episcopal tracts. Among the motives Loomis (1955: 236) enumerates for a writer to adopt a pen name, "safety (in respect to satiric or erotic utterances)" and "freedom (for unorthodox expression)" are those which prompt Penry to conceal his identity, the good sense of his precaution demonstrated by his execution after falling into the hands of the authorities. However, as Room (1989: 28) contends, the "ultimate in literary masks (...) is to take no name at all —to write anonymously." The anonymous approach is the line taken by the Narrator, the purported author of Marlowe's life, who jealously guards his identity throughout the narrative. Loomis (1955: 236) cites "modesty (possibly colored by doubt about the creation's value)" as the first reason for a writer to mask his identity. From what he says about himself the Narrator's anonymity is prompted by shame: the self-introduction "small actor and smaller play-botcher" is indicative of a life devoted to the public playhouse, a calling regarded as an inferior, degrading and decadent way of life. Worse still, "small actor" intimates that he began his career as a boy-actor, with the implications of cross-dressing this has for the imagined early Modern reader of the book. The undesirable stigma of being an actor and playwright is compounded with the disgust aroused by his confession that he was Marlowe's catamite. In the eyes of his contemporaries his passive sexual role makes him even more contemptible than Marlowe in that the assumption of that role entails forfeiting his male identity (Smith 1990: 186). The subject-matter of his memoir also

counsels the Narrator remaining anonymous. Not only is the narrative a notorious atheist and sodomite who came to a violent but fitting end in a tavern brawl, it also has the effrontery to try to enlist the reader's sympathy for so shocking a character. Perhaps the motive that has carried the most weight in the Narrator's decision to withhold his name is, as with Penry, safety. In the age of mandatory religious belief in which the book was ostensibly written the string of profanities the Narrator cites as a manner of coda to his blazon of Marlowe,

> [a]t first as at last he was a fair curser and ingenious in his blasphemies, as for example (God and the reader forgive me and the licensers of print, if this should attain print, avert their eyes (...); after all I do but report as to posterity's own Privy Council, this not my mouth but his) by the stinking urine of John the Baptist, by the sour scant milk of God's putative mother the Jewish whore, by St Joseph's absent left ballock, by the sore buggered arses of the twelve apostles, by the abundant spending of the stiff prick of Christ crucified, and the like [p.4],

would undoubtedly have got him into trouble with the authorities, despite the disclaimer. A former transvestite actor and the boyfriend of a godless apostate and libertine that dares plead the case of the man that debauched him: the Narrator has good cause not to keep his identity secret.

The concealment of identity emerges as one of the recurrent themes in *A Dead Man in Deptford*. In the Narrator's case identity is concealed by the simple expedient of not revealing it, although in the epilogue he offers some clues as to what his name is. For the most part the characters conceal their identities through imposture, by passing themselves off for what they are not. That is, they take a role and play it out with a view to deceiving their victims, although the impostors conserve their names.

13.2.2. Identity as Performance

In the preceding sub-section persona was re-defined as the actualisation of a role through the performance of the actor who has assumed that role. Performance, however, is absent from both the Narrator's opposition between *identity* and *guise*, which merely separates actor from character, and Jacques' thumbnail sketch of the senile, infirm old man, which merely delineates a character. The creation of persona of the old man through the interpretation of the role of the old man may be inferred from the narrative report of Marlowe's attendance at the staging of *The Spanish Tragedy* cited in the introduction to 13.1., more specifically to the second sentence,

> Kit (...) was on a stage stool, next to Watson, much taken by Ned Alleyn, younger than he by a year but altogether the quavering ancient as Hieronimo, Marshal of Spain.

The complex apposition which takes up most of the sentence may be regarded as an instance of syllepsis, a figure of speech in which two co-ordinate constructions are brought together by means of ellipsis (Wales 1989: 445). In this case the ellipted component is *Ned Alleyn was*, making *younger than he by a year* and *the quavering ancient* complements of the same subject, despite predicating contradictory attributes of its referent. While the first subject complement characterises the named by attributing youthfulness to him, the second identifies him as an old man. The contradiction is resolved by the prepositional phrase *as Hieronimo*, indicating that it is the dramatic character Alleyn personates that is described as "the quavering ancient." Nevertheless, the adverbial *altogether* implies more than a convincing performance. Together with "Kit (...) was (...) much taken by Ned Alleyn," *taken* understood as 'induced to believe' as well as 'fascinated,' the adverbial suggests that the actor is not playing the part of Hieronimo: he *is* Hieronimo.

In the light of the stress placed on role in Jacques' version of the *theatrum mundi* conceit, Alleyn's convincing personation of Hieronimo relates the creation of the dramatic persona to the construction of personal identity. To begin with, the view that the actor actualises the role he assumes through his performance underlies the distinction Goffman (1959: 244), anticipating Butler's identity as performance, draws between self-as-character and self-as-performer in his theory of self-presentation in social interaction. Roughly, then, self-as-character more or less corresponds to persona, what is created through performance, and self-as-performer to the actor, conceived as a self endowed with the necessary skills to put on a performance. Morgan et al. (1979: 4) seem to build on Goffman's model when they refer to the self's interpretative skills as personality, defined as the inner complex of resources he or she has for the creation of personae.

Where Morgan et al. part company from Goffman is in the former's inclusion of character in their account of personal identity. Character is defined as self's reputation in the minds of others, particularly with respect to his or her moral qualities, and is considered to be a reflection of the deepest and most stable features of the subject's inner self (Morgan et al. 1979: 4). Although, as the authors admit, gleaned from the various personae displayed by self, and therefore giving rise to differing and conflicting assessments and interpretations, character is made up of the "fixed and stable attributes of an individual human being," effectively equating it with identity. Morgan et al.'s

equation of character with identity accords with the contrast the Narrator makes between actor and dramatic role, with the consequent conflation of character as they define it into actor. Goffman's model of the self split into performer and character does not fit as neatly in the identity-guise binarism as Morgan et al.'s distinction between character and persona, despite the former's explicit recourse to the metaphor of dramatic presentation for the purposes of explicitation. Whereas there is a perfect match between self-as-character and persona, self-as-performer corresponds not to identity, but to the player who creates the persona, leaving identity as Morgan et al. conceive it unaccounted for. Self-as-character, Goffman (1959: 245) is at pains to stress, is the product, and not the cause, of the player's performance, and for this reason it would be naïve to regard it as a manifestation of his or her inner self. Since, according to Morgan et al.'s model, it is inferred from personae, identity is as much a product of the performance put on by self as persona is.

If self-as-performer may be thought of as an actor interpreting a role in a stage play, and self-as-character as the dramatic persona projected via the interpretation, the task still remains of accommodating identity to Goffman's dramaturgical analogy. As a starting point for such a task one may relate the statement that "[w]hen an actor takes on an established social role, usually he finds that a particular front has already been established for it" (Goffman 1959: 37) to the gallery of types presented in Jacques' speech. As indicated in the introduction to this section, the old man personifies a social role characterised by senility and infirmity, characteristics which pre-exist the social actors who assume this role. Since the role is prior to the actor, it may be identified with Goffman's established social role, definable as an unactualised role waiting for an actor to assume it. Accordingly, the lines written for the character Hieronimo constitute an established dramatic role, as opposed to persona, created through the role embodied by the actor who declaims those lines onstage. Identity, then, is informed by the established roles assumed by the actor to the extent to which his or her performance conforms to the set patterns of behaviour expected from these roles.

Given the relevance of role in the constitution of identity, accessible through the actor's interpretation of the role he or she plays, self-as-performer is conceived of as "the peg on which something of collaborative manufacture will be hung for a time (...) for producing and maintaining selves" (Goffman 1959: 254). The qualification of *collaborative* points to one of the peculiarities of the drama enacted in social interaction, namely the compression of actor and audience in the self-as-performer (Goffman 1959:

9). As well as putting up a performance, self attends the performance given by the selves with whom he or she is interacting. The term *collaborative* also serves to link the perspective of theatrical performance to politeness, concretely face-work, the mutual maintenance of face. Holtgraves's definition of face as "one's public identity" (2005: 74) suggests, in the light of the view of identity as something performatively constructed, that the upholding of other's face in social interaction is analogous to the audience's acceptance of the actor's histrionic personality, particularly in situations in which the co-participants are not well acquainted with each other. The polite suspension of judgement on the interlocutor until the situation is defined resembles the suspension of disbelief regarding to what is enacted onstage. Once the situation is defined, and the co-participants are known to each other, social interaction follows a set sequence of behaviour established in previous encounters similar to a routine in a dance or comedy act (Goffman 1959: 27) so that stable social relationships establish more or less permanent roles like the established dramatic roles to which actors must conform their performance onstage. On the other hand, playing a part in the immediate presence of is a means of exercising some measure of control over others' responsive treatment of self with the aim of guiding the impression they form of him or her (Goffman 1959: 15). As regards politeness, the influence the self-as-performer seeks to exert on his or her audience relates identity as performance to demeanour, behaviour exhibited to create a favourable self-image (Goffman 1956: 489). Since face can only be maintained by other, self seeks to induce other to do so by demeaning him or herself properly, that is, by behaving in such a way as to give to understand the possession of socially approved qualities which makes him or her deserving of attention to his or her face wants.

Finally, identity as performance raises the question of sincerity, or the performer's belief in the part he or she is playing. Goffman (1959: 28) draws a distinction between performances in which self is taken in by act he or she puts on and those in which he or she is not. In the latter case the objective of the performance is often to delude those to whom it is directed by making them believe that self takes seriously the persona he or she is projecting, or, as Poley puts it, in enduing "the great mask of simulation." Insincere performances like Poley's false profession of the Catholic faith nevertheless presupposes a concern for the impression it creates for their audiences, in his case because the success of his mission depends entirely on the Babington plotters' belief that he is indeed one of their own. On the other hand, there are insincere performances in which self is indifferent to whether they are taken in by their audiences or not,

performances which Goffman (1959: 28) calls cynical. A good example of a cynical performance is depicted in "[w]hen the fish came in, brought by a shy maid at whom Skeres, as if taught to do so in some stage comedy, leered" [p.42]. The comparison of Skeres's heavy-handed flirting to playing a comic role suggests ham-acting: the expression of his sexual interest in the girl is laid on so thickly that it is patently clear that his advances are not meant to be taken seriously. In other words, he is feigning to feign an interest he does not really have, and feigning ineptly. By hamming up his overtures of friendship to Marlowe, via the adoption of a hyperbolically over-familiar style of address (see 9.3.1), Skeres deliberately causes his performance to fall flat, leaving no doubt as to the insincerity of the feeling of amity he purports to feign. Deliberately inept over-acting, then, may be used as an impoliteness strategy which adds insult to injury by signalling to its target that he or she is not worth the trouble of putting up an elaborate deception.

13.2.3. Identity as Performance and Identity as Essence

Identity as performance is one of the conclusions reached in Butler's critique of gender essentialism (1990: 16-25). The main thrust of her argument is that gender is not an ontological given, but culturally constructed through regulative discourses that prescribe which possibilities of sex, gender and sexuality are "natural," and subsequently internalised by the subject through the repetition of stylised acts in time. Gender, and the social roles assigned to it, is a fiction accorded a specious kind of existence by virtue of the subject's acting in conformity with the prescriptions which ostensibly reflect "natural" distinctions of sex. As gender is assumed to be one of the relatively durable components of personal identity (Abercrombie et al. 2000 [1984]: 171), identity itself turns out to be a construct created through reiterated acts. Butler's claim that "there is no gender identity behind expressions of gender" (1990: 25), modelled on Nietzsche's dictum that "there is no being behind doing," may be recast as there is no identity behind guise insofar as identity is constituted through the guises under which the actor presents himself.

The suspicion that doing rather than being constitutes identity is expressed in the sharp contrast between Alleyn's commanding stage presence as Hieronimo and the impression of vacuity given by the actor once he has divested himself of the part he has been playing:

> And Ned Alleyn, removing from his young and blank face, the paint of lined age, smirked, a creature of null person as of null features, the condition of his art, the empty vessel to be filled with what the poet brewed, what there was of him so to say with the buskins off was a nullity that nonetheless gave off a manner of heat [p.15].

The reference to Alleyn as an "empty vessel to be filled with what the poet brewed," reminiscent of Goffman's description of the self-as-performer a peg on which to hang a social persona, effectively relegates him to the status of a mere prop for the playwright's dramatic creations, a relegation underscored by the co-occurrence of the contextually synonymous adjectives *blank*, *null* and *empty*, together with the noun *nullity*. The annulment of the actor's personality turns the notion of personation on its head: Alleyn may embody Hieronimo by speaking the lines the playwright has written for the part, but it is the character he plays that invests him with a striking personality which he otherwise lacks. Alleyn becomes Hieronimo, and all the other characters he plays, because he has no distinctive identity of his own. This is borne out by the greeting he receives from a group of appreciative theatre-goers on being recognised in a tavern: "Jolly eaters waved or nodded, and some gave him the fanfare of What outcries" [p.23]. The quotation from Hieronimo's soliloquy over his murdered son (*The Spanish Tragedy* II v 1-15)[51], one of the most memorable speeches in *The Spanish Tragedy*, is indicative of the absorption of Alleyn into the part which has made him a celebrity: for the theatre-going public Alleyn is Hieronimo off as well as onstage. Behind the playing of Hieronimo, it seems, there is no real identity.

A more transparent allusion to Nietzsche's pronouncement that being is a fiction created by doing is made in the excerpt quoted in 3.1.2.,

> I must suppose that what I suppose of his doings behind the back of my viewings is of the nature of a stout link in the chain of his being, lost to my seeing, not palpable but of necessity existent,

which presents Marlowe as a performing self as well as the object of the Narrator's conjectures. The relation between the first terms of each internal rhyme, *his doings* and *his being*, carries resonances of the Nietzschean prevalence of agency and will over essence: Marlowe is constituted through the actions he is imagined to have performed rather than being pigeon-holed as a sodomite or atheist. Given the vindicatory nature of the memoir, the Narrator's speculative re-construction of Marlowe's deeds seemingly reverses the assumption Nietzsche's notion of performative identity is premised on. The philosopher contends that the performing subject is "animated through accusation, as

[51] J.R. Mulryne's edition.

the origin of an injurious action" (Butler 1997: 46), the injurious action imputed to Marlowe being his treacherous attack on Ingram Frizer recorded in the inquest finding into his death, backed up by the unsavoury reputation he has gained as a violent and dissolute malcontent. In the Narrator's account Marlowe is first denigrated and then murdered, transforming him from a guilty to a wronged subject. This leaves intact Nietzsche's contention that the subject is called forth out of the need to place responsibility for a blameworthy act, although blame is shifted from Marlowe to those who denigrated and murdered him. It also makes him the subject of two contending discourses that define him arising from the hostile and sympathetic interpretations of his behaviour.

As indicated above, the notion of identity as performance is can placed in the reaction against essentialism, the belief that essence, the intrinsic nature which makes an entity what it is, is prior to existence. With regard to personal identity, the essentialist view holds that selfhood is determined among other things by the individual's sex, social class and ethnicity, the ontological givens whose objective existence Butler calls into question. A king, for example, would accordingly be defined by his kingly nature, irrespective of whether he rules or not, or whether or not he displays his nature through his deportment and bearing. Returning to the intertextual frame examined in 13.1.3, the essentialist reading of *Edward II* presents the reversal of fortune undergone by its protagonist as a recovery of his regal identity. While throughout his reign Edward conspicuously neglects duty for pleasure, once dethroned and a captive he begins to acquit himself with the dignity consubstantial with the rank he has been stripped of. In the Narrator's terms, the transition from irresponsible hedonism to resigned stoicism strips away the guise of the effete voluptuary concealing the King's true identity. The irony, on which the tragic effect of the play largely depends, is that Edward acts as a king should after his deposition.

Writing apropos of the rhetorical question the King asks in the deposition scene,

> But what are kings, when regiment is gone,
> But perfect shadows in a sunshine day?
> (V i 26-7),

Weil (1977: 165) endorses identity as essence. "Growing less like a 'perfect shadow', Edward seems to realize that his royalty has been no mere costume." However, on reading the answer immediately given to the question,

My nobles rule; I bear the name of king;
I wear the crown; but am controll'd by them,

the four lines are more cogently construed as a subscription to the performative view of identity. To begin with, the King's lament is as much a summing up of his turbulent reign as a description of his predicament he finds himself in on making the speech. Neither before nor after his fall is Edward a king in deed, because he was a *bon vivant* dominated by his favourite while he was on the throne, and because he is at the mercy of his rebellious vassals when he finally acts as a king. In either case kingship is revealed to be a role which Edward belatedly tries to assume rather than an intrinsic part of his self.

The tone of aporia which pervades the Narrator's memoir is also inimical to identity as essence. This is confirmed in Marlowe's tautological reply to the question of whether *Marlowe* or *Marley* is his real name, referred to in 13.2.1. The truncated reiteration of Jehovah's reply to Moses' asking for his identity in "I am what I am what I am what I" in effect constitutes a *reductio ad absurdum* the concern of substance theory, the metaphysical manifestation of essentialism, with the discovery of the essence which underlie each entity. The concatenation of subject complements shows up the futility of a philosophical enquiry which has essence as its ultimate object (Ayers 1998: 205) by enacting a process of infinite deferral which suggests that essence does not exist materially. Moreover, as the first word of the repeated clause is an interrogative pronoun, Marlowe's answer may be read as an interrogation of his identity. Selfhood, the essence of a person, is either a fiction or so elusive as to be impossible to apprehend, making the quest for self-knowledge an interminable interrogation of what one is.

The ontological pessimism expressed in the parodic amplification of Jehovah's expression of ontological self-sufficiency is reminiscent of the linguistic pessimism with which Plato's *Cratylus* ends (see 2.1.4), which relates the issue of onomastic appropriateness to that of personal identity. To begin with, the infinite deferral the quest for the true self leads to parallels the interminable regression of etymologies the quest for the true meaning of a name results in (see 10.3.5.1), apparently aligning onomastic appropriacy with identity as essence. The Cratylean stance that a name ought to reflect the nature of its nominatum upholds, and is upheld by, the essentialist view on identity inasmuch as an appropriate name presupposes a stable nature. Accordingly, *Kit* is an appropriate name for Marlowe because it is a reflection of the feline nature attributed to him. On the other hand, identity as performance renders onomastic appropriacy

untenable because it deprives the name-giver with an intrinsic nature to apply a name to, a situation which would favour the conventionalist position on naming. It might be argued that the existence of a fixed identity need not be a *sine qua non* for an appropriate name. Accordingly, the variants of *Marlowe* are all appropriate to the degree that they each reflect the personae their common bearer presents on different occasions. This solution, however, is unpractical as it would entail giving the bearer as many names as personae he displays, as well as calling him by different names on different occasions. Onomastic appropriacy and identity as essence, then, stand and fall together, and the infinite deferral to which the attempts to ascertain both the true self of a person and true meaning of his or her name lead seemingly confirm the futility of such ventures and countenance identity as performance and onomastic arbitrariness.

13.2.4. The Creation of Identity

The player-playwright relation deduced from the Narrator's description of Alleyn as an "empty vessel" draws attention to the puppet-like character of theatrical performance. The actor plays the part written by the dramatist, without which there can be no performance. The player's dependence on the playwright is discernible in Marlowe's account of his craft: "I must create men and women and eke create voices for them" [p.137]. "[M]en and women" is soon emended to "*personae* that stalk the stage," indicating that the men and women he speaks of are in reality the characters of the plays he pens, embodied by the actors who personate them. The term *personae* refers to both dramatic roles and the players that interpret them insofar as characters can only stalk the stage in the literal sense of the predicate when they are being played. In *The Spanish Tragedy*, then, Alleyn stalks the stage in the role of Hieronimo, one of the "men and women" created by Thomas Kyd for the play. The necessity to "create voices for them," however, serves as a reminder that *dramatis personae* speak as well as appear onstage. Again, the pronoun *them* collapses role into actor in that characters acquire their voice by virtue of the players that declaim the lines written for them. In view of Alleyn's characterless-ness the authors of the plays he appears in may be regarded as constructing an identity for him through the creation of the dramatic roles he is cast in.

The creation of voices for dramatic characters is also indicative of the scripted nature of theatrical performances. These are scripted not simply in the sense that a dramatic role consists of the lines declaimed by the actor at every performance, but also in the sense that the role specifies the way the actor playing it is to behave during the

performance. In playing the role of Hieronimo, Alleyn becomes "the quavering ancient," which means that his performance must be an imitation of the behaviour expected from an old man if it is to come off. Ungerer and Schmid's definition of a script as a knowledge structure designed for a frequently recurring event sequence (1996: 213-14) can also be accommodated to the analogy of social with dramatic role. In each stage presentation of *The Spanish Tragedy* Alleyn, as Hieronimo, performs the same actions: bewail the loss of his son, demand justice from the King of Spain, plan revenge when his pleas are not answered, take the law into his own hands, and finally go mad. Following a dramatic script, then, acting in a manner appropriate to the type of person represented by the dramatic character guided by the lines written for the role.

The scripted character of Alleyn's interpretation brings to mind interpellation, the process whereby individuals acquire their sense of identity (Abercrombie et al. 2000 [1984]: 184). For many writers the acquisition of personal identity is achieved through the action of discourses which induce identification with the social roles self is given to perform, with the result that the individual comes to define him or herself through these roles. In terms of the *theatrum mundi* conceit, interpellation consists in casting the individual into a role that is made his or own through subsequent performances. Alleyn's identification with the character of Hieronimo is effectuated through performances in different stagings of *The Spanish Tragedy* in which the actor repeats the same lines and makes the same gestures. The interpellated self, or subject, is endowed with agency insofar as he or she is a performing subject; but since performance is discursively regulated, agency is not equivalent to autonomy, although the subject often acts under the impression that his or her actions are the outcomes of voluntary choices. Alleyn exercises his prerogative as the top-billing actor of the Lord Admiral's Men in turning down Marlowe's *Dido, Queen of Carthage* on the grounds that "I am not Aeneas" [p.19]. What the declination reveals is as much Alleyn's limitations as an actor as his freedom to pick the parts he wishes to play. He has been given so many roles involving the delivery of ranting and bombastic speeches, such as Hieronimo, that he is both unable and unwilling to play less extravagant characters like Marlowe's Aeneas which allow less scope for hamming up the performance. As a typecast actor, then, Alleyn stands for the always-already interpellated social subject.

Where the analogy between the stage and the world shows signs of breaking down is in the role accorded to discourse in each domain. A play like *The Spanish Tragedy* is a text, at once the effect and cause of discourse: as the outcome of a productive process in

the first case, and as the point of departure for an interpretative process in the second (Fairclough 1989: 24-5). As the product of discourse, socially conditioned linguistic interaction (Fairclough 1989: 23), a play contains traces of the process that has produced it, which in case of *The Spanish Tragedy* is the moralising on the disintegration of human society precipitated by the absence of justice (Mulryne 1989 [1970]: xxi). Human society in the real world, by contrast, is configured through a variety of contending discourses representing rival ideologies, or systems of settled beliefs and assumptions about the world (Fowler 1986: 27). The aim of official discourse, discourse at the service of the ruling elite and their adherents, or dominant bloc (Fairclough 1989: 33), is to perpetuate the power relations underpinning the social relations it purports to reflect, either by winning others' consent or exacting their compliance through coercion (Fairclough 1989: 33; Dollimore 1991: 26). Interpellation aids the legitimisation and naturalisation of the existing power structure by reconciling the ruled to the subordinate social positions they are placed in and inculcating in them an attitude of intolerance towards non-conformity and dissent. Dissident discourse challenges the assumed right of the ruling elite to possess and exercise power and seeks to change existing relations by enlisting the help of others to remove the privileges of the former. In this case interpellation is to be understood as raising others' awareness of their domination by the ruling elite. The co-existence of conflicting discourses is a reflection of the power struggle which characterises relations between social groupings with different interests.

In *A Dead Man in Deptford* Marlowe is placed at the centre of the contention between two discourses concerning the definition of sexuality. The dominant moral discourse seeks to make of him a monogamous, philoprogenitive heterosexual subject, ideologically through the Biblical interpellation of "[m]ale and female created he them" (Genesis 1: 27), and coercively through the reminder of what awaits the obdurate sinner, namely "burning, as Sodom was burned" [p.57]. Marlowe counters the compulsory heterosexuality of his time through, as Munson Deats (1997: 126) says of Tamburlaine, an act of self-conscious self-creation, but as a poeticising, transcendent homosexual subject instead of an all-conquering warring one. In this process of self-shaping, which draws heavily on an uncompromisingly homoerotic reading of Plato (see 6.2 and 6.3.), he is interpellated from another source. Asked on one occasion why he is attracted to men and boys rather than women, Marlowe replies with:

> —There is a divine command, Lucretius calls on *Alma Venus*, delight of gods and men, and it may not be questioned. She commands me the way I must go and ever has, and nothing may be done [p.142].

The crux of his mythologising is that homosexuality, like procreative heterosexuality, is an identity assumed through a fiat issued by an external power. In other words, Marlowe's eschewal of "the bestial law of breeding" laid down by God's creation of Adam and Eve is not done out of choice but because he is compelled to. In poetry, moreover, Marlowe finds the discursive means of giving shape to a sexual identity whose existence is denied by the falsely coherent account of sex and gender presented by a dominant moral discourse that reduces male-male eroticism to proscribed sexual acts (Smith 1990: 22).

All processes of self-creation, then, necessarily involve interpellation, whether its source is dominant or marginal discourse. This accords with the materialist view of identity as performance given by Butler, which stresses the subordination of consciousness and will to material agency, rather than the existentialist view espoused by Nietzsche, which emphasises the individual person as a free and responsible agent who determines his or her development through acts of the will. The materialist position on the creation of identity differs from the existentialist one in that it stresses self's agency at the expense of will. To begin with, self-fashioning is limited to the role models offered by competing discourses, as evidenced by the restriction of Marlowe's choice to poetic and Biblical discourse. Also, as Greenblatt (2005 [1980]: 9) points out, defining oneself against the roles created by dominant discursive practices is a form of acknowledgement of the power structures which underlie such practices. The contention that rebellion against the established power entails submission to it can be teased out of the harangue Marlowe delivers to his chamber-fellows at Corpus Christi:

> —I am what Harry Eight, may devils ceaselessly prod his gross belly, I am what he and his mumbling ministers, may their fiery farts be bottled and uncorked on Unholy Shatterday, I am what we have been made. And all for a black-haired whore he had put in pod [p.5].

The substance of his declamation, another amplification of Jehovah's reply to Moses request to identify himself, is that Marlowe is as much a product of the Reformation as the most devout Anglican is. If Henry the Eighth had not broken with Rome, he would not be the irreverent critic of the Church of England he is. The power structures which operate through official discourse interpellate dissidents as well as adherents.

13.2.5. Interpellation and Naming

In the account given in the preceding sub-section on the creation of sexual identity the term *interpellation* is used in the sense of bringing the subject into existence. Both the homosexual and heterosexual identify themselves as such by complying with an injunction to do so, implicitly in the latter case insomuch as the Biblical account of the creation of two clearly differentiated sexes can be read as an exhortation to accept procreative heterosexuality as a binding norm of conduct. As the instances of interpellation under review involve issuing a directive, interpellation is shown to be performative and vocational in character.

As regards the vocational character of interpellation, one might start by pointing out the preponderance of the etymological meaning of the base the adjective is derived from, *vocation*. Latin *vocatio,* itself a derivation from the verb *vocare* signifying 'call,' means among other things 'spiritual call,' a meaning retained its present-day reflex when it used to denote the decision to devote oneself to the ministry or a profession. In referring to an activity as a vocation, then, the person engaged in it is in a sense responding to a call made by that activity. Accordingly, by describing interpellation as vocational, what is meant is that the assumption of a social role may also be envisaged as a response to a call made to the subject to assume it. As outlined in 13.2.4, Marlowe represents himself as being called on to assume his homosexual identity, the verb *call on* eliding commanding with vocative address. Once the interpellated subject is identified with the role he or she is called on to assume, *vocational* takes on its most common present-day acceptation, namely 'especially suitable for oneself.' Despite the prevailing homophobia of his time, Marlowe comes across as being quite at home with his homosexuality, the Freudian observation that "nothing may be done" about the "divine command" to "escape from our mothers" being an indication that he neither feels ashamed of his sexual inclinations nor intends to modify them.

The term *vocational* presents interpellation from the point of view of the interpellated subject. For the opposite point of view a more appropriate term would be its cognate *vocative,* the adjective that describes the act of calling someone. However, as seen in 2.2.4.1, calls perform only one of two vocative functions, the other being addresses. The distinction between call and address renders the term *interpellation* a "felicitous ambiguity," to adopt an expression from Fairclough (1989: 28). The term is felicitously ambiguous because it can be used to refer to interpellation as a single speech act performed on a particular occasion, or one habitually performed on separate but

similar occasions. Following Butler (1997: 33), interpellation considered as a single speech act will be termed inaugurative, and consists in calling the person to be interpellated. The mythologised creations of the heterosexual and homosexual subject seen in 13.2.4, for example, are both instances of inaugurative interpellation. For want of a better term interpellation considered as repeated performances of the same speech act will be termed constitutive, because it consists in preserving the identity the subject is called on to assume through an act of inaugurative interpellation. Inaugurative interpellation seeks to produce a subject by calling on an individual to assume an identity while constitutive interpellation seeks to maintain that identity by addressing the subject to reaffirm him or her in the identity he or she has. As Butler (1997: 33) points out, however, inaugurative interpellation comes off only if the person hailed acknowledges the identity to be assumed as his or her own. An interpellation can, to borrow a term from Austin (1962: 16), misfire: a person may be called on to assume a role but decline the call. The confessional episode reviewed in 6.3.1 and 6.3.2 enacts a misfired attempt at interpellation: Marlowe's tautological reply "I am as I am" to Father Ballard's "[m]ale and female created he them" [p.57] expresses a stubborn resistance to his transformation from a homosexual to heterosexual subject. Constitutive interpellation involves the subject's recognition of having the identity he or she has assumed. Marlowe's disclosure that "I have committed fornication (...) [b]oys and men" [p.56] may be regarded as an instance of constitutive interpellation in that it expresses more a reassertion than confession of his homosexual identity.

The respective association of inaugurative and constitutive interpellation with calling and addressing uncovers a link between interpellation and naming. First, the two vocative functions are performed by personal names, providing names with a role to play in the interpellation of the subject (Butler 1997: 31-2). Second, a name condenses in a single morpheme the complex of attributes that makes up the bearer's sense of identity: gender, ethnic tradition, religion, social class, time and place of birth, order of birth, upbringing and physical appearance (Seeman 1980: 129). The broad variety of distinguishing features susceptible of being connoted by a name reminds one of Searle's definition of "pegs on which to hang descriptions," which shares the same metaphor Goffman makes use of for his definition of the self-as-performer already quoted in 3.2.1, "the peg on which something of collaborative manufacture will be hung for a time." The shared metaphor makes for the merging of name into identity under a common definition: a name is a peg on which to hang the manufactured identities of the

interpellated subject. To some extent the merger of name into identity is captured in one of the definitions the OED gives of *name*, "[o]ne's repute or reputation" (1989 VII: 13), in which the entry word is not described as a type of linguistic expression, but in terms of what it conveys about the bearer's character as perceived his or her acquaintances. Third, and last, the term *naming* shares the same felicitous ambiguity of *interpellation* insofar as it means 'giving a name to somebody' as well as 'calling, addressing or referring to somebody by their name.' Name-giving parallels inaugurative interpellation in that the imposition of a name confers an identity on the recipient, and is therefore a form of bringing the named into existence. By the same token addressing by name corresponds to constitutive interpellation in that each use of the name confirms the identity of its bearer. Names not only identify their bearers but also form part of their identity, and for this reason play an important role in the interpellation of the subject.

In 2.1.2 name-giving was described as performative naming. As an utterance the bestowal of a name is performative because in establishing a naming convention one effectively brings about a change in the existing state of affairs: a hitherto nameless entity can now be named. Inaugurative interpellation is likewise performative in that, by successfully calling on an individual to assume an identity, a subject is created where none existed previously. Addressing someone by name, argues Butler (1997: 32), is also performative because to use a name to address someone is more than the observance of a naming convention: it maintains the convention instituted by the inaugural act of giving someone a name. Similarly, constitutive interpellation is performative in that it upholds the power relations the subject submits to on taking on the identity he or she is called on to assume. Above all, a naming convention is maintained through the repeated use of the same name to address or refer to the bearer on separate occasions, which makes naming an exercise of identity as performance. Carroll's casual chain of reference (1985: 175), the genealogy of naming acts that goes back to an initial baptismal ceremony, seems to countenance this view. Thomas Walsingham's claim that "Tom Watson said Kit was enough" [p.48], for instance, identifies Watson's statement as the institution of the naming convention to be applied to Marlowe by his colleagues in the Service. As an act of inaugural interpellation, the preference for *Kit* to *Marlowe* or *Christopher* defines its bearer as an agent in government service that ought to acquit himself, in the words of the Privy Council's certificate of good conduct, "orderly and discreetly" [p.112].

To be precise, naming is identity as *verbal* performance. The maintenance of the identity lexicalised in the name is achieved through the utterance of the same name every time its bearer is addressed or referred to. The iterability of the name underwriting identity as performance is due to what Butler (1997: 49) terms its citationality. To name someone is to cite someone insomuch as the namer must first learn which name to use from someone that already has. That is to say, the namer invariably cites the person from whom he or she has learned the name in an act of didactic naming, either from the bearer in the case of a self-introduction, or a person that already knows or knows of the bearer. The casual chain of reference turns out to be a chain of citations as well. The members of the Service that address Marlowe as *Kit* follow the example set by Watson and Walsingham, who in turn learned the name through Marlowe's self-introduction as *Christopher*.

Naming as citing, as Butler (1997: 49-50) points out, problematicises the principle of authorship and authority. The casual chain of reference, and citation, presupposes an inaugural name-giving, which in turn argues for the existence a name-giver, even though his or her identity is unknown to the namer. In Marlowe's case the name-givers are his parents, who chose to christen him *Christopher*. Choice of name is nevertheless conditioned by a set of conventions (Lieberson 1984: 77), not least the existence of a repertoire of names from which name-givers take their pick. Considering that they chose but did not invent the name they bestowed on their son, and considering that there is already the precedent of boys being christened *Christopher*, Marlowe's parents may also be thought of as citing others. The citation is not of other namers, however, but of other name-givers who have imposed the name on their sons prior to the Marlowes. In this sense, then, they are not the authors of the naming practice they institute when they christen their son, but are applying one of a wealth of ready-made conventions for the primary identification males. Just as social roles pre-exist those who occupy them, names pre-exist their bearers.

The notion that citation is concomitant to naming applies to labelling as well, together with the attendant questions on authorship and authority. In 11.3.2.2 and 11.3.2.4 reference was made to the ripple effect of Robert Greene's character assassination of Marlowe. Greene's sidekick, Cutting Ball, is instructed to proclaim Marlowe's atheism to all and sundry, who pick up and relay the slur until it reaches the ears of the authorities, creating thereby a casual chain of citations contributing to the labelling of Marlowe as an atheist. The practice of picking up information and keeping

it for future use appears to be a common one in the Service. To Marlowe's surprised "[y]ou sound more scholarly than I would have thought should fit your office," Skeres replies "[o]h, I am no scholar. A picker up only. I cite bonny Robin" [p.93]. What he does not say is that he is a passer-on of the information as well, as are the other members of the Service. Skeres's encounter with Marlowe at the execution of the Babington plotters, the situation in which the above exchange takes place, soon becomes common knowledge within the Service, as evidenced by Nicholas Faunt's comment "Skeres told me of your heaving and spewing" [p.97]. The claustrophobic atmosphere of spying and tale-bearing reigning in the Service also makes Marlowe into a purveyor of information he receives. At the Deptford meeting he cites Ballard's "Holy Mother Church (...) ordains burning" for the "foul sin" of sodomy [pp.56-7] when he informs Frizer and Skeres that "[t]hose who took their love otherwise must be punished with fire and brimstone" [p.256]. As he includes himself among "[t]hose who took their love otherwise," Marlowe's citation of Ballard's citation of Scripture not only provides another instance of the citationality of labelling, it also suggests his interpellation as a sodomite, despite the tongue-in-cheek manner in which he relays the punishment meted out to homosexuals.

13.3. Recapitulation

The all's-world-is-a-stage theme is one suggested by the theatricality of the novel. That is to say, *A Dead Man in Deptford* contains many elements borrowed from a stage representation, the most conspicuous of which being its play-within-a-play structure. As regards naming, the principal topic of this thesis, personal names have given way to personal identity as the main focus of the present chapter, although *name* and *identity* are rendered synonyms in the reference to the Narrator's appearance in *Much Ado About Nothing*. Consequently, in dealing with identity, one is also dealing with names as well. As Room (1989: 7) says, "[o]ur names not only identify us, they *are* us: they announce us, advertise us and embody us[52]."

As a synonym of *identity*, however, *name* is also synonymous with *guise*, the term that is in opposition with *identity*. In the theatrical context it occurs in *guise* refers both to the dramatic persona assumed by the actor and the name borne by the persona. Since the dramatic persona is animated through the performance put up by the actor playing it, the name identifies a being brought into being through performance. A persona, then,

[52] Emphasis in the original.

exemplifies the concept of identity as performance: a semblance of existence created by playing a role. The name of the dramatic persona contributes to the simulacrum to the extent that the existence of a name presupposes the existence of a nominatum. Thus, Hieronimo is a character that acquires an identity by virtue of Ned Alleyn's performance of the part, an identity underscored by the name *Hieronimo*, under which the actions making up the performance are integrated into a seemingly coherent whole. Just as the combination of performance and name builds up an identity for a dramatic persona, so performance and name combine to constitute the identity of the performing bearer. Alleyn accordingly acquires his identity through the dedication to his art, which is a kind of performance, expressed through the name *Ned Alleyn*. Naming and performance confer existence on identity.

Since the dramatic persona is a role, a script that regulates the performance of the actor that assumes it, the identity created through the performance is conditioned by the acts that are required by the role. To create the identity of Hieronimo, then, Alleyn must play "the quavering ancient," and not the haughty beauty, which identifies Bel-Imperia. In social interaction, too, there must be a "confirming consistency" (Goffman 1959: 35) between the behaviour exhibited by the self-as-performer and social role he or she is carrying out: that is, performance must follow the script for the role. Both social and dramatic roles, moreover, are selected rather than created (Goffman 1959: 38). Alleyn, for instance, turns down the role Aeneas but accepts those of Tamburlaine, Faustus and Barabas. Nevertheless, his choice of role is subtly forced by his predisposition for a certain type of character resulting from the fact that he has played no other type: it is more a case of the part selecting the actor than the actor selecting the part. The social self likewise casts him or herself into a given social role through the unconscious compliance with ideologies enshrined in discourse, a role gradually internalised through the repetition of the acts prescribed by that role. Insofar as repeated naming accompanies repeated performances, names also identify the roles the subject is called on to assume.

The theatrical perspective *A Dead Man in Deptford* encourages is based on the distribution of roles among the characters of the novel through the intertextual frame established by the numerous references to other literary works. The description of the memoir as "Kit's tragedy" casts Marlowe in the role of the tragic hero, and his enemies as the agents that bring about his final downfall.

14. Tamburlaine and Faustus: Marlowe’s Literary Personae

In 13.2.3 mention was made of the quotation of Hieronimo's "What outcries" soliloquy as a greeting to Ned Alleyn in relation to the identification of the actor with the character. After winning his dramaturgical spurs, Marlowe is similarly regaled with references to the plays he writes when he is seen in public, with the difference that he is addressed as the main characters of his dramatic works

> 82. Kit took his early dinner at the Three Tuns, where, his past rowdiness forgiven or forgot, he was welcome enough as Mr Tom Berlaine or Dr Forster [p.189].

As they are based on the character names *Tamburlaine* and *Faustus*, the nicknames he is addressed by suggest a much stronger identification of Marlowe with the parts he writes than that of Alleyn with the parts he plays. Whereas the greeting called out to the latter separates actor from character, the welcome extended to the former conflates playwright into character, a conflation traceable to the creator-creation relation of Marlowe with Tamburlaine and Faustus. "Now, Mahomet, if thou have any power" (*2 Tamburlaine* V i 185) and "[n]ow, Faustus, thou must needs be damned?" (*Doctor Faustus* I v 1) are not Alleyn's words, even though he utters them, but Marlowe's. And because they are the dramatist's words, the speeches the characters deliver are apt to be interpreted as expressions of his own views, despite Marlowe's caveat "[n]ot my thought though my words" [p.156]. For the more literal-minded of the audience Tamburlaine's challenge to Mohammed and Faustus' soul-searching before striking his pact with Lucifer are Marlowe's words *and* his thought.

As the alleged vehicles for his views the Scythian warlord and German doctor in divinity personify their creator's much vaunted contempt of religion. Writing about the biographical Christopher Marlowe, Burgess (1970: 87) indicates that the more orthodox of his contemporaries

> were not slow to ascribe Tamburlaine's atheistical *Machtpolitik* to his author. And when *Doctor Faustus* appeared, it was assumed that Marlowe was being fancifully autobiographical: he, like the fearless seeker after ultimate truth and pleasure, must have sold his soul to Lucifer.

The belief that Faustus is a thinly veiled portrait of Marlowe is written into in the following narrative report of the reputation he gains as a necromancer in the wake of the mass hysteria the play provokes in its audience:

> Christopher or Kit was (...) pointed at as one that could raise the devil with Latin, and with Greek call back Helen of Troy from the dead, and his frequent knocking at the door of Durham House was noted and speculation raised about what devils were to be conjured in the turret study whence black fumes floated [p.156].

The reference to Durham House is a broad allusion to Marlowe's membership of the discussion group presided by Walter Raleigh, popularly believed to be a hotbed of atheism on account of their rationalist approach to religion. Even before joining the Raleigh set, Marlowe is already considered a notorious atheist because of his penchant for airing his cavalier attitude towards religion in public. Faustus and Tamburlaine embody two forms of atheism which Hunter (1984: 142) terms inward and outward respectively: "irreligious views openly expressed and those that the holders keep to themselves." As he is addressed in [82] as both *Dr Forster* and *Mr Tom Berlaine*, Marlowe is seen as both an inward and outward atheist. Following Burgess's theory that Tamburlaine and Faustus each represent the two halves of Christopher Marlowe's split personality (Burgess 1970: 102), *Tamburlaine* names the public Marlowe, the tavern orator who seeks to win atheist proselytes, and *Faustus* the private Marlowe, the thoughtful scholar who tries to demolish religious belief through reasoned argument.

Along with his homosexuality, atheism is a facet of Marlowe's transgressive nature which has inhered in *Kit* following the semantic contagion the name undergoes through the various phonological relations it enters into, particularly its apophony with *cat*. The literary personae Marlowe is identified with through the address therefore constitute an intertextual frame which complements the characterising function performed by the feline metaphor. Like the cat, Tamburlaine and Faustus symbolise the causal relation of waywardness with vulnerability which forges Marlowe's "chain of being," the one character hypostasising his outrageous godlessness, and the other the consequences of his scepticism.

14.1. Marlowe Viewed through "this Tragic Glass"

Like the anecdotal report of the Narrator's appearance as Bel-Imperia in *The Spanish Tragedy*, his summing up of Marlowe's acquaintance with Walter Raleigh as "the prologue to (...) Kit's tragedy" adverts to the play-within-a-play device adopted in *A Dead Man in Deptford*. The depiction of Marlowe attending a stage presentation, as stated in the introduction to 13.1, is an enactment of the play-within-a-play, throwing into relief the *mise-en-abyme* effect produced by this form and reduplicated in Burgess's novel, notably in the infinite deferral suggested by the variations shown by the family name *Marlowe* and the tautological concatenation of the subject complement in "I am what I am what I am what I" (see 13.2.3). The summarising description of Marlowe's first interview with Raleigh points to the mirroring effect Nelson (1958: 11-35)

attributes to the play-within-a-play form, although the connection can only be made on considering the context of the interview. Like the Narrator, Raleigh sees Marlowe for the first time on occasion of the performance of a play, the sequel to *Tamburlaine*, introduced by the prologue which ends with the request to

> View but his picture in this tragic glass,
> And then applaud his fortunes as you please
> (7-8).

The tragic glass through which the audience observe Tamburlaine's fortunes refers, as Levin (1961: 48) points out, to the traditional conceit which likens *de casibus* literature to a mirror held up to reality, and the fall of the fictional princes related therein to the reflection of the vicissitudes which potentially befall real-life princes. Accordingly, in describing his memoir as "Kit's tragedy," the Narrator gives to understand that the events of Marlowe's life subsequent to his encounter with Raleigh are ordered along the same lines as the events enacted in a tragedy so that the genre may be said to be mirroring the dramatist's life. More specifically, the tragic glass in which Marlowe is reflected is made up of the literary texts which provide the narrative with its intertextual frame, particularly *Tamburlaine* and *Doctor Faustus*. The mirror conceit can also be extended to, and blended with, the feline conceit hypostasised in *Kit* as a result of the semantic contagion undergone by the name on account of the phonological relations it enters into, making the name a tragic glass which gives a reflection of Marlowe's waywardness and vulnerability.

14.1.1. The Tragic Structure of the Narrative

The tragic reading of Marlowe's life prompted by the Narrator's recapitulation of the playwright's first meeting with Raleigh is one frequently evoked by biographers of Christopher Marlowe and students of his work. Hotson (1925: 9) opens his monograph on the death of the dramatist by observing that "[t]he life and death of Christopher Marlowe make one of the few dramas in our history which satisfy Aristotle's definition of tragedy," an observation backed up by the "pity in the violent death that cut down such a tall genius in its [sic] youth" and the "terror (...) in the reasoned denial of God of which (...) the man was guilty." Boas (1940: 116) refers to Christopher Marlowe's death as "the tragedy at Deptford" and describes his life as a "drama as absorbing as any of his own tragedies" (1940: 308), implicitly likening the dramatist's work to a mirror which reflects his life. Bakeless (1942) models his two-volume critical study of the poet

and playwright, *The Tragicall History of Christopher Marlowe*, on the full title of the 1604 impression of his play inspired by Doctor Faust, *The Tragicall History of D. Faustus*, effectively identifying its protagonist with his creator. Levin (1961: 160) similarly identifies Christopher Marlowe with Faustus with the remark that "[n]ature imitated art so ruthlessly that Marlowe's life became an Atheist's tragedy," rendering *Doctor Faustus* "not merely (…) a literary testament, but (…) a kind of deathbed recantation." Finally, Steane (1965: 26) attributes "the tragedy of [Christopher Marlowe's] life" to his "restless, conflicting, unstable spirit," a condensed reprise of the Aristotelian perspective Hotson brings to bear on "the tragedy of Marlowe" (1925: 9). In inviting the Reader to view Marlowe's fortunes through the tragic glass he has the Narrator hold up, Burgess takes up and develops the parallels between Christopher Marlowe's art and life drawn by these authors.

Hotson, as seen in the preceding paragraph, bases his tragic view of Christopher Marlowe's life on the fear and pity it arouses, since Aristotle (1996: 17) defines tragedy as the imitation of "events that evoke fear and pity." For Mercer (1987 [1973]: 251) what is central to tragedy is the philosopher's concept of *hamartia*, the error of judgement committed by the tragic hero which sets in train the events inexorably leading to his final downfall (Cuddon 1979: 301). In *Tamburlaine* and *Doctor Faustus*, the plays which mirror Marlowe's life in *A Dead Man in Deptford*, the fatal error their respective heroes commit is their attempted arrogation of attributes of divine power: God's omnipotence in the first case, and his omniscience in the second. His identification with Tamburlaine and Faustus renders Marlowe guilty of the same contempt of God's majesty, enabling his death to be read as condign punishment for his effrontery. Such a reading of the dramatist's fate, however, is more homiletic than tragic so that it is more likely to arouse a feeling of satisfaction rather than pity. Although the tragic hero must accept a measure of responsibility for the initiating the process which brings about his destruction, the consequences are always out of proportion to the gravity of his act (Mercer 1987 [1973]: 252). In presenting him as the victim of a conspiracy to have him murdered, the Narrator likewise insists on the hostility of the forces which conspire to destroy Marlowe in his memoir of the dramatist, which is what transforms biography into tragedy.

Both *hamartia* and *hubris* define the tragic hero as fallible but not wicked character. He is, in Aristotle's words (1996: 21), a "person who is not outstanding in moral excellence or justice" but whose "change to bad fortune (...) is not due to any moral

defect or depravity, but to an error of some kind." Applied to Marlowe, this definition is re-formulated in a long-winded manner as

> It is to me somewhat of a relief to sum what happened between Christmas and Whitsun without occasion to besmirch Kit with the dirt of it, for I loved and yet love his genius and if I sometimes hated the man it was not because of craft and deviousness, rather because of a candour of word and act that, being the fruit of innocence, would at length stick in his throat and choke him [p.79].

In the main the sentence is an exoneration of Marlowe for his part in the capture and execution of the Babington plotters. The reference to the absence of "craft and deviousness" in the dramatist suggests ignorance of the consequences his participation in the frustration of the plot will lead to, an ignorance indicated by the qualification of *a candour of word and act* as *the fruit of innocence*. The parody of Ben Jonson's eulogy on William Shakespeare contained in "for I loved and yet love his genius and (...) sometimes hated the man[53]" nevertheless leaves no doubt that Marlowe's candour is viewed as a shortcoming. Marlowe is summed up as a great poet but extremely fallible human being who more often distressed than contented the Narrator.

Despite the occasional feeling of resentment because of his thoughtlessness, the Narrator acknowledges that Marlowe's outspokenness caused more harm to himself than others, to the point that it eventually led to his undoing. The attribution of his untimely end to his reckless lack of tact identifies this fault as Marlowe's tragic flaw, the defect in his character which impels him to commit the fatal error. Thomas Kyd gives the flaw a name when he admonishes him that "[y]ou will regret indiscretion when your dying eyes see in an instant the cutting out of your beating heart and the tumbling into the air of your bloody bowels" [p.25]. As well as naming the abiding weakness in Marlowe's character, Kyd's graphic reference to hanging, drawing and quartering highlights the gross disparity between the triviality of the offence and the severity of the punishment. Although Marlowe does not die in the manner described by Kyd, the cold-blooded killing at the hands of his former associates is well in excess of the breach of discipline he is guilty of.

If Kyd names Marlowe's tragic flaw, it is Robert Poley that identifies Marlowe's fatal error. At the Deptford meeting Poley apprises him of how Essex's intrigues against Walter Raleigh affect his doubtfully reliable colleague:

---

[53] "And to justifie mine owne candor, (for I lov'd the man, and doe honour his memory (on this side Idolatry) as much as any.) Hee was (indeed) honest, and of an open, and free nature : had an excellent *Phantsie ;* brave notions, and gentle expressions : wherein hee flow'd with that facility, that sometime it was necessary he should be stop'd" ("Discoveries Made upon Men and Matter and some Poems," 2008).

—It has been in preparation, the destruction of Raleigh. The outer works are first attacked. You should have never let yourself be befriended by him [p.260].

As a protégé of Raleigh's, Marlowe is deemed a legitimate target by Raleigh's deadly rival at court, a predicament he would have escaped if he had not accepted his patron's friendship: hence the Narrator's verdict of Marlowe's voluntary entry into Raleigh's orbit as "the prologue to Kit's (…) tragedy." The conversation between Marlowe and Raleigh after a performance of *2. Tamburlaine*, the event which prompts the description, is described as a prologue because it ends with Raleigh inviting the innovative young dramatist whose play has caught his attention to pay him a visit at his London residence, Durham House. Marlowe's acceptance of the invitation marks the beginning of his troubles, the tragedy proper.

Marlowe's mistake is consequent on his besetting vice, his indiscretion. He places himself under the aegis of Raleigh fully aware of the obloquy it will bring down on him on account of the bad odour in which his new patron is with a section of the ruling elite. The Service, as Nicholas Faunt informs him, considers placing Raleigh under surveillance because of his "strange doings with mathematicians and atheists" [p.69], an idea Thomas Walsingham repeats with the observation "Raleigh, they say, must be watched" [p.86]. In joining Raleigh's intellectual circle, Marlowe in effect makes a public declaration of apostasy. His regular attendance at Raleigh's sessions transforms *hamartia*, the commission of an error, into *hubris*, the stubborn persistence in the error provoked by the tragic flaw despite frequent warnings to desist (Cuddon 1979: 311). First, Marlowe disregards the superstitious awe he stands in among the uncultured because of the magical powers he is believed to have picked up from the "mathematicians and atheists" of the Raleigh set:

his frequent knocking at the door of Durham House was noted and speculation raised about what devils were to be conjured in the turret study whence black fumes floated [p.156].

Next, he ignores the broad hint to leave Raleigh Walsingham drops in

—Your body does not smell as it did. There is a rankness.
—Suffused with love of my nymph tobacco.
—Yes, you are one of Raleigh's tribe. Raleigh must be on his guard.
—This he knows.
—You will be safe with me.
—Am I in danger?
—If Raleigh cannot easily be struck down, others may be in manner of a warning [p.182].

Finally, Marlowe resists the pressure brought to bear on him to denounce Raleigh's alleged atheism to the authorities. His loyalty to his patron is what brings about Marlowe's nemesis, the punishment the tragic hero suffers for his insolence (Cuddon 1979: 418), at the hands of Ingram Frizer.

From the rundown just given it becomes apparent that there are close structural correspondences between the Narrator's life of Marlowe and tragic drama that justifies the description of "Kit's tragedy." What also transpires is the centrality of Marlowe's association with Raleigh to the tragic structure given to *A Dead Man in Deptford*. The adverse effects of the marriage of minds that unites him to Raleigh are seized on by Marlowe's colleagues in the Service, first as a means of controlling an unreliable agent who knows too much, and then, when he proves obdurate to their threats and cajolements, as a pretext for eliminating him. The identification of Marlowe with Tamburlaine and Faustus, tragic heroes of his own creation, strengthens the connection between the fate that befalls him and his friendship with Raleigh, particularly as regards the rationalist perspective they bring to bear on institutional religion.

14.1.2. Tragedy and the Quasi-Homophony of Kit *with* Kyd

As indicated in the introduction to this section, the semantic contagion of *Kit* makes it a tragic glass in which the reader is invited to view Marlowe's fortunes as related by the Narrator. By virtue of the feline connotations acquired by the name through the phonological relations it enters into with other lexical items, *Kit* comes to stand for a character trait attributed to its bearer and the consequences the displaying of this trait has for him. On the one hand, the wandering-cat and struggling-cat metaphors reflect Marlowe's sexual and intellectual vagrancy, characteristics identifiable with his indiscretion, the tragic flaw which draws him to his destruction. On the other hand, the drowning-cat metaphor embodies the perilous situation he gets himself into as a result of his indiscretion. As an emblem of how his waywardness makes him vulnerable, then, the felinity conveyed by *Kit* fits into the *hamartia-hubris-nemesis* pattern Aristotle establishes in tragedy. The wandering cat corresponds to Marlowe's fatal flaw of indiscretion, the struggling cat to his insistence in being indiscreet, and the drowning cat to the consequences he brings down on himself because of his indiscretion.

Of the various phonological relations Marlowe's familiar name forms part of perhaps its near-homophony with *Kyd*, briefly examined in 7.2.4, is the relation which links these relations to the intertextual frame the tragic structure of the narrative in which the

Narrator's relation of Marlowe's life is placed. The excerpts cited for the exemplification of the pairing of *Kit* with *Kyd*, it will be remembered, were taken from the passage depicting the drinking and supper party Marlowe attends after a performance of *The Spanish Tragedy*, an occasion on which a manuscript of his closet drama *Dido, Queen of Carthage* is vetted by Ned Alleyn and Thomas Kyd. The principal finding yielded by the examination was the eduction of the non-onomastic co-homophone of Kyd's family name, *kid*, followed by the eduction of *goat*. The subsequent discussion focused on the sexual connotations of the latter term triggered by Alleyn and Kyd's objections to the homoerotic content they find in Marlowe's play. Homoeroticism, however, is only incidental to Marlowe and Kyd's exchange of views on the business of making plays, centred on the contrasts between their dramatic pieces. Since it provides the broad context of the passage as well as the main topic of conversation of the characters, the theatre is also responsible for educing *kid* and *goat*, although with different associations from those previously discussed.

Like the play just staged, *Dido* can be classed as tragedy owing to the disproportion between the cruel fate of its heroine and her attempt to prevent Aeneas from fulfilling his destiny. The term *tragedy*, explains Burgess (1970: 74), can be traced back to the Greek for *goat*, and refers to a ritual sacrifice of this animal accompanied by a choral song in honour of the god Dionysus (Cuddon 1979: 703). By virtue of their joint homophony with *kid*, *Kyd* and *Kit* stand for the common calling of their respective bearers as writers of tragedies. At this point Marlowe and Kyd's relationship resembles the Platonic master-disciple association. The spectacular success of *The Spanish Tragedy* lends weight to Kyd's defence of his sensationalist rendering of Senecan drama for the playhouse and his criticisms of Aeneas' relation of the sack of Troy, part of which is recited at the drinking party. Marlowe, after initial doubts, takes good note of the innovations Kyd introduces and uses them in his own stage plays. With the exception of *Dido* Marlowe's plays exhibit the same tendency to represent rather than report acts of extreme violence which characterises *The Spanish Tragedy*. Marlowe is not only a willing pupil but also proves to be an exceptionally able one, eventually surpassing his master and inverting the roles in their initial relationship. A few years later Kyd repays the compliment by asking Marlowe, now bearing the laurels for *Tamburlaine* and *Doctor Faustus*, to read drafts of his work and give suggestions for its improvement.

Marlowe's future paramountcy is also anticipated by the mythological basis of the etymology of *tragedy*. As suggested by the clause *Kit drank deep* in

> Kyd gorged. Tom Watson ate with delicacy. Kit drank deep and praised the Beregerac red [p.24],

he is depicted drinking wine and getting steadily getting drunk throughout his first meeting with Kyd, until he has to be carried off in a state of complete inebriation. Dionysius, the presiding deity of the drama, is also the god of the vine, wine and mystic ecstasy (Kershaw [ed.] 1990 [1951]: 128-9) so that Marlowe's intemperance is interpretable as a form of worship, and his drunkenness the inspiration to write plays vouchsafed to him in return. His dipsomania is balanced against Kyd's gourmandising, expressed by *Kyd gorged*, a balance already noted in 7.2.4 in relation to their sexual appetite. Semantically, both *gorged* and *drank deep* convey the notion of immoderate ingestion in that the adverbial *deep* may be paraphrased as *too much*, and the verb phrase *gorged* as *ate too much*. The semantic and phonological links between the two sentences conspire to identify excess as a shared distinguishing characteristic of the bearers of *Kyd* and *Kit*: the one eats too much while the other drinks too much, and both have an inordinately powerful sex drive. Their common lack of restraint is also reflected in the dramatic fare they serve, namely their tendency to write acts of gratuitous violence into their stage plays. Kyd's hurried and disproportionate eating, however, lacks the Dionysian associations Marlowe's weakness for wine has, suggesting that he is not as inspired a playwright as the latter is. Indeed, subsequent references to Kyd's career emphasise the falling off in the quality of his plays. At another meeting Marlowe finds Kyd reduced to "[b]otching and collaborating" and "back to the noverint's work for the odd shilling," eaten with "envy at the acclaim that Kit's work had earned" [p.194].

Towards the end of the supper party, as a roaring drunk Marlowe is led out of the eating house, Kyd "shook sadly his head (...) and, in a mood of prophecy, said he gave him but few years" [p.26]. His prediction is prompted by Marlowe's increasingly disorderly conduct as he becomes more and more drunk, particularly as regards his vociferous insistence in airing to all and sundry the cynical view of religion he holds. The prophecy is fulfilled: eight years later Marlowe is dead, killed in a so-called tavern brawl at the end of another supper party; but the prophet little knows that Marlowe's indiscretions will be the cause of his undoing as well. As a trained scrivener with an "admirable Italian hand," he is asked, and agrees, to write out a copy of the anti-Arian

tract Walter Raleigh commissioned Marlowe to make as an aid for a discussion on the divinity of Christ (see 5.1.2). The commission is forgotten, but the manuscript comes to light when Kyd's lodgings are raided in the course of a government crackdown on political dissidence, and his papers seized and examined in search of seditious literature. Arrested on suspicion of authorship of a series of libels which threaten to break the peace, Kyd now faces a charge of heresy. Broken by torture, and holding Marlowe in little esteem, he shifts the responsibility for the "Vile Heretical Conceits," as the tract is now taken to be, to Marlowe, alleging that he was forced to copy them out under threat of violence. The upshot of the interrogation is the warrant summonsing Marlowe to the Privy Council to account for the opinions expressed in the papers under examination, the occasion on which Richard Baines hands in his incriminatory note whose contents tallies with what Kyd has denounced to his interrogators about Marlowe's "violent and atheistical speech" [p.237], condemning him to the untimely end Kyd has both prophesied and contributed to.

Their relationship ends badly: Marlowe lands Kyd into trouble, and Kyd betrays his uncongenial associate, although under torture. The blend of unfortunate coincidence and mutual responsibility for the unhappy end they both suffer exemplifies the arbitrary chances of fate that, together with the disproportion of evil to human action, tragedy emphasises (Mercer 1987 [1973]: 252). Besides a shared professional concern with the stage, then, the quasi-homophonous relation between *Kyd* and *Kid* is indicative of the role their bearers are given as victims of circumstance. As stated above, the term *tragedy* is a throwback to a religious ceremony in which a goat is ritually sacrificed. In this respect the names each bears identifies Kyd and Marlowe as men destined to be offered up as a sacrifice on behalf of the preservation of the existing social order. Tragedy is not only something they write: it is something they experience as well.

14.2. The Identification of Marlowe with Tamburlaine

Tamburlaine lends his name, in its inoffensive form of *Tom Berlaine*, to Marlowe's public persona of the proselytising atheist. Thanks to Robert Greene's skewed reading of the climactic episode of *2 Tamburlaine*, the challenge the hero issues to Mohammed to strike him down for burning Islamic scriptures, the play is taken as an incitement to atheism. The première of the play is also the occasion on which Marlowe is introduced to Raleigh, a notorious free-thinker whose subsequent association with the dramatist supports the allegations of atheism made against the latter. Marlowe consequently

stands doubly accused of atheism: by creating a reputed atheist, and consorting with a reputed atheist and his cohorts. What the Narrator calls Kit's tragedy is both contextualised and framed by *2 Tamburlaine*. The reception of the play provides the background to Marlowe's acquisition of his reputation for holding atheistical opinions, and the correspondences between Greene's misconstruing of the Koran-burning episode and the distorted perception of Marlowe constitutes the frame through which the consequences of the latter's acquired reputation are to be interpreted.

14.2.1. The Parallels between Tamburlaine *and Kit's Tragedy*

On reading Tamburlaine's Koran-burning speech in its entirety, it becomes apparent that Greene's ascription of atheism to the warlord is based on a biased resolution of the character's ambiguous attitude towards the question of the existence of a personal god. Just before issuing the order to cast the books looted from a mosque on a bonfire, Tamburlaine positively asserts his belief in the existence of a supreme being to whom he owes fealty:

> There is a God, full of revenging wrath,
> From whom the thunder and the lightning breaks,
> Whose scourge I am, and him will I obey
> (*2 Tamburlaine* V i 181-3).

In the light of this assertion the taunt Tamburlaine hurls at Mohammed for his failure to respond to the challenge he is presented is not so much an affirmation that there is no God as a denial that the deity the prophet represents is that God. On the other hand, the statement asserting the existence of a god full of revenging wrath is weakened by hedge in the exhortation to worship a worthier deity than Mohammed that rounds off the speech:

> Seek out another godhead to adore:
> The God that sits in heaven, if any god,
> For he is God alone, and none but he
> (*2 Tamburlaine* V i 198-200).

The parenthetic conditional clause entertains the possibility that the deity Tamburlaine has in mind does not exist. However, this would make Tamburlaine an agnostic, not an atheist, although, given the status of *atheism* as an umbrella term for a host of heterodox views, this is sufficient grounds for Greene calling him an atheist.

Tamburlaine's speech is an example of what Burgess (1970: 88) terms Marlovian inconsistency, definable as the openness of his plays to two readings which cancel each

other out. The sequel to the challenge is another example of such inconsistency, this time with regard to the author's attitude to his creation's act of defiance. At the end of the scene, as his army prepares to march off, Tamburlaine is struck ill, "I feel myself distemper'd suddenly" (*2 Tamburlaine* V i 206), and in the third and final scene of the play he is portrayed in his sickbed raging impotently against the illness he will eventually succumb to. Coming immediately after his act of sacrilege, his sickness may be construed as divine punishment for Tamburlaine's effrontery (Levin 1961: 71), a construction supported by the dying man's exclamation "[w]hat daring god torments my body thus" (*2 Tamburlaine* V iii 42). According to this reading, the Koran-burning episode conforms to the *hubris-nemesis* pattern of tragedy, rendering Tamburlaine's career as a cautionary tale for those tempted to put the power of God to the test. However, Marlowe's dictum "[n]ot my thought though my words," allows a less edifying reading of the episode and its sequel. It is Tamburlaine that attributes his sickness to the action of a vengeful deity, which resolves the ambiguity regarding his belief in a personal god contained in the Koran-burning speech, but the ambiguity regarding the relation between his challenge and his sudden illness remains unresolved. While Tamburlaine's words suggest that his sickness may be consequent on his challenge, it may also be argued that the former is simply subsequent to the latter. The invitation to "applaud his fortunes as you please" leaves it the spectator to decide whether this relation is one of cause-effect or temporal succession.

In addition to Marlovian inconsistency, the Koran-burning episode exemplifies what Marcus (1996: 66) calls the Marlowe effect, defined as the way in which "Marlowe's lurid reputation (...) so uncannily replicated the flamboyant excesses of his dramatic heroes." Greene's reading of Tamburlaine's sacrilegious *hubris* and death parallels the Narrator's presentation of Marlowe's alleged atheism and death at Deptford Strand. The difference between them resides in the type of relation assumed to obtain between action and event in each case. Whereas Greene's atheist reading of *Tamburlaine* favours the relation of temporal succession between challenge and death, the conspiracy theory advanced by the Narrator supports the causal relation between unorthodoxy and death. What Marlowe and Tamburlaine share is not, as Greene claims, a stance of *non credo*, but one of *non serviam*. If the potentate will not acknowledge a deity incapable of preserving his worshippers from the depredations of their enemies, the dramatist will not embrace a religion whose dignitaries practise the direct opposite to what they

preach. Marlowe's quarrel is therefore with institutional religion rather than the god it pays lip-service to, the existence of whom he is unsure of. Tamburlaine's boast that

> My sword hath sent millions of Turks to hell,
> Slew all his priests, his kinsmen, and his friends,
> And yet I live untouch'd by Mahomet
> (*2 Tamburlaine* V i 177-9).

mirrors and magnifies his creator's denunciation of the hypocritical self-seeking of the ecclesiastic hierarchy and the exposure of the contradictions in the body of doctrine which underwrites their authority. His sceptical anti-clericalism qualifies Marlowe as the cynical atheist, characterised by the thesis that religion is a political device to maintain the ruling elite in their privileged positions, and the practice of undermining the spiritual authority of the ruling elite by drawing to inconsistencies in the scriptures, the base that authority is grounded on (Hunter 1984: 141). Marlowe's hostility to institutional religion, as argued in Chapter 11, not only incurs the enmity of his more conservative contemporaries: it is also provides his enemies with a weapon that can be used against him. Greene works off the jealousy for Marlowe's success by denouncing *Tamburlaine* as a platform for the dramatist's atheism, and the reputation Marlowe consequently gains is exploited by the Service as a means of bringing a recalcitrant agent to heel and a blind to his elimination. The provocation-retaliation pattern is inferable from both the challenge-sickening sequence in *2 Tamburlaine* and the criticising-labelling-murdering sequence in *A Dead Man in Deptford*.

Another feature believed to define the cynical atheist is his exhibitionism, behaviour associated with the intellectual and verbal agility which comes from a good education (Hunter 1984: 141-2). Marlowe is portrayed as conforming to this stereotype in this respect as well, particularly in the early part of the novel. The narrative proper begins *in medias res*, with Marlowe provoking his most devout schoolfellows by showing up the logical absurdities contained in the instances of Scripture and Anglican doctrine he quotes [pp.5-6]. At the first supper party he attends he declares Niccolò Machiavelli to be the liberating spirit who "taught us (...) the show of holiness is in the service of the love of power" [pp.23-4], a devotion to the Florentine political philosopher being another hallmark of cynical atheism (Hunter 1984: 141). His stage plays is the ultimate manifestation of Marlowe's intellectual exhibitionism in that it enables his irreverent perspective on received truths to reach a wider audience, including discerning minds like Raleigh. In these plays, as the Narrator writes apropos of the premiere of *1*

Tamburlaine, "there were voices (...) that bade us better comprehend the times and question old assumptions" [p.119]. The desire to show off his intellectual sophistication through his skill at disputation is replicated by Tamburlaine's rhetorical proficiency, which gives him the ability to threaten "the world with high astounding words" accompanying the power to scourge "kingdoms with his conquering sword" (*1 Tamburlaine* Prologue 5-6). Besides a willingness to ride rough shod over other people's religious convictions, Marlowe and Tamburlaine share the eloquence that allows them to pack a more powerful punch to their respective assaults on established values.

In many respects the downfall of Marlowe and Tamburlaine are ultimately traceable to their loquaciousness. The cause-effect interpretation of the Koran-burning episode attributes Tamburlaine's sickness not so much to the devastation his hordes have brought to the Mohammedans as the challenge he issues to Mohammed to punish him for the havoc he has wrought. In Marlowe's case the inability to keep his own counsel is a manifestation of his indiscretion, the tragic flaw that leads him to his perdition. His "candour of word" is refers to his insistence on talking about best left unbroached, and the observation that this "would at length stick in his throat and choke him" to the necessary consequence of shooting his mouth off. Each time he indulges in the bad habit of rubbishing institutional religion, he receives warning of where this will take him, which is invariably ignored. Marlowe's schoolfellows threaten to report him to his tutor for his blasphemous misreading of the Scripture [p.6], Kyd reproaches him for expressing his enthusiasm for Machiavelli too openly and draws his attention to a snoop writing down what he has said [p.23], and Greene accuses him of being a publicist for atheism through *2 Tamburlaine* [p.145]. Once his reputation for atheism is consolidated, all kinds of malicious rumours concerning his evil living are readily believed, including the moralising over his death in a tavern brawl. The blackening of Marlowe's character resulting from his indiscretion stands as proof of the truth of the childhood adage Butler (1990: vii) cites: making trouble is the prelude to getting into trouble.

14.2.2. Tamburlaine *as an Aid for Labelling*

A sure sign of the trouble Marlowe's trouble-making is getting him into is his identification with the eponymous hero of *Tamburlaine* in the wake of the sensation caused by the play. As discussed in 11.3.2.1, Greene's allegation that Tamburlaine is a mask through which his creator voices his own irreligious views effectively labels

Marlowe an atheist. The relation of co-referentiality established between the two variants of *Marlowe* in

> 47. This is Merlin the Marlin that dared God out of heaven [p.146]

and the complement of the second prepositional phrase in "daring God out of heaven with that atheist Tamburlan" [p.145], from Greene's denunciatory pamphlet, leaves no doubt that Marlowe and Tamburlaine are one and the same. Accordingly, if Tamburlaine is an atheist, Marlowe is one too.

Butler (1997: 2) relates labelling, under the terms *name-calling* and *injurious speech*, to interpellation. To label a person is a form of calling forth and constituting a subject by casting that person into a social role. By exposing Marlowe as an atheist, Greene grants him a social existence of sorts, the unenviable and paradoxical one of the outcast. As the term suggests, the outcast is the person who has been driven out of society on account of some unforgivable transgression, a expulsion symbolically brought into effect by ostracising the transgressor. On the other hand, given the performative character of social identity, the ostracised individual cannot be ignored indefinitely. The atheist exists as an atheist by continually reaffirming his or atheism in word and deed, after as well as before being labelled as one. As a result the guardians of social stability are forced to acknowledge the existence of those cast out of society, either by denouncing their obduracy or calling on them to repent of their evil ways and rejoin the flock. The call for Marlowe to abjure his alleged atheism is made in Greene's valedictory pamphlet:

> —Wonder notte, thou famous gracer tragedians that Greene, who hath saide with thee like the fool in his hearte There is no God should nowe give glorie to his greatnesse [p.225].

The most extreme form of acknowledging the existence of the unrepentant outcast is by making an example of him, a course of action urged in the Baines Note, "I think all men in Christianity ought to indeuor that the man of so dangerous a member may be stopped" (quoted in Steane 1965: 364), and in Marlowe's case carried out in the form of an extrajudicial execution. Like interpellation, then, labelling not only gives a person a social identity, it also maintains that identity through the repetition in time of utterances that advert to the behaviour or attitudes stigmatised by the label, whether it is to revile or denounce them, or to exhort the transgressor to renounce them.

As with interpellation, the performative character of labelling is a result of a citational practice. Once Marlowe has been labelled an atheist, he will continue to be called one by those who perceive him as one, perpetuating the convention instituted by the imposition of the label. Excerpt [47], uttered by Greene as a disparaging introduction of Marlowe to his interlocutor, prompts "The tambourine man that goes ding dang rattle to God's deep sackbuts." *Tambourine man* is a deformation of *Tamburlaine* while *ding ding rattle*, abetted by *tambourine*, is a jeeringly onomatopeic description of the declamatory terms in which Tamburlaine's challenge to Mohammed, here identified with God, is delivered. This second utterance is basically an echoic sentence confirming the content of [47], namely that "that atheist Tamburlaine" is Marlowe. The citational character of labelling is revealed more explicitly in the way the atheist label is bandied about through the streets of London after the publication of Greene's libel: Greene "has his bully Ball bawling it about" [p.144], which is eventually relayed to Marlowe in the debased form "Mr Marlin the ace, he is" [p.143]. Greene is cited by Ball, who in turn is cited by those who hear him.

The manner in which Marlowe discovers that he is being defamed illustrates how the social constitution of the individual takes place without him or her being aware of it (Butler 1997: 31). As seen in 11.3.2.2, it is not until he remarks on the incident to Alleyn and Henslowe that he finds out that he is being slandered by Greene. Everybody except the target himself knows he is an atheist. Unlike interpellation, then, labelling does not necessarily involve addressing the person to be socially constituted: the subject may be created in the absence of the person labelled. Further, together with the confrontation with the Greene subsequent to the discovery, the incident shows that labelling differs from interpellation in another respect. The interpellated subject is a consenting subject who readily identifies him or herself with the social role he or she is called on to assume. The labelled subject, by contrast, does not consent to the social identity imposed on him or her, although there is very little that can be done to elude it. Once labelled an atheist, as Marlowe learns, everything he subsequently does and says will be perceived as the words and deeds of an atheist.

The giving or withholding of consent conditions the element of recognition that subsists in the constitution of the subject. Interpellation consists in the subject's recognising him or herself as belonging to the identity offered, and as a result being more willing to engage more deeply with the role associated with the identity. When Marlowe discovers that he is becoming known as an atheist, there is recognition but no

acknowledgement. On hearing *Mr Marlin*, he recognises that the utterance containing the titular name concerns him; but on learning that *the ace, he is* is a garbled form of *atheist*, he firmly rejects the label. In the dramatic frame the narrative is placed the discovery that Marlowe is the object of defamatory claims concerning his orthodoxy corresponds to the Aristotelian notion of *anagnorsis*, the moment of recognition when ignorance gives way to knowledge (Cuddon 1979: 38). Recognition of this sort involves the realisation of the negative repercussions of being labelled an atheist, not the fact of being one. The airing of atheist views, as Greene cynically reminds him, "is very perilous" [p.148], particularly if word of Marlowe's atheism should reach the Privy Council. According to Aristotle (1996: 19), recognition should occur simultaneously with reversal of fortune, or *peripeteia* (Cuddon 1979: 500). In Marlowe's case the discovery that he is the victim of a character assassination marks the beginning of a prolonged process of declining fortunes, completed with his enforced return to government service, signalled by Nicholas Skeres's mocking salutation of *Kit Merlin* when he arrives at Newgate to inform Marlowe of the terms of his bail (see 11.3.2.4).

In spite of his resistance to being labelled an atheist, Marlowe's views on religion are scarcely consistent with the Pauline thesis of the divine origin of the authority wielded by prince and prelate alike that underwrites the Anglican establishment. His summing up of his position,

> The truth is that there are no atheists, since who would be so witless as to assert what he cannot prove? Simply and in all candour we must shrug and say we know nothing. God's book is man's book, since God handles no quill. These bishops with their termagant wives throw the book at us and say believe because I demand belief and by God I will hang and quarter you if you do not [p.161],

reveals him to be a sceptic as regards the existence of God and a dissident as regards the authority of the Church of England, a scepticism and dissidence stemming from a disregard of the injunction to be socially constituted as an obedient rather than devout Anglican. In other words, Marlowe refuses to be interpellated, although his refusal implies that he has already been interpellated as a questioning and dissenting subject by marginal discourses which provide alternative perspectives to the status quo to that offered by the official one. One such discourse that appeals to Marlowe is the Machiavellian one, based on the premise that a ruler may sometimes resort to immoral expedients to hold on to power but must always be publicly above reproach, a maxim he feels is especially applicable to the ecclesiastic hierarchy. The other discourse that influences him is the natural philosophical one developed in Raleigh's intellectual

circle, which confirms Marlowe in his rejection of a priori arguments while teaching him to reach his conclusions by arguing from first principles, including matters concerning religious faith. His acceptance of Raleigh's invitation to become a member of his set, signalled by his introduction to tobacco, marks the constitution of Marlowe as an enquirer after the truth. "An atheist," as Raleigh is reputed to be, "at least has set working the engines of thought" [p.161].

"Thought," Father Ballard counters, "has killed millions and will yet kill more" [p.62], a warning sounded through Marlowe's reference to the bishops' readiness to put to death those who do not comply with their demand to accept without question what they claim to be the truth. The first step in their destruction is identify sceptics and dissidents by labelling them atheists, those, as John Lyly defines them, who "reject the Church of the Reform" [p.161], meaning the Church of England. Labelling therefore consists in recreating the subject produced by a rival discourse by redefining him or her in terms of the discourse he or she has rejected. The sceptical and dissenting Marlowe created by the Machiavellian and rationalist discourses is recast as Marlowe the atheist by the dominant orthodoxy, a recasting initiated by his identification with the godless heathen Tamburlaine.

14.2.3. The Reflection of Other Characters in Tamburlaine

In terms of the feline conceit the transition from making trouble to being in trouble is captured in the metamorphosis of the wandering-cat and struggling-cat metaphors into the drowning cat metaphor. Marlowe's persistence in airing his agnosticism and cynical view of institutional religion is, as seen in the conclusion to 14.2.1, a form of asking for trouble insomuch as it will eventually goad those offended by his insolence to take action against him. The nickname derived from *Tamburlaine*, *Tom Berlaine*, links the trouble he gets himself into to the feline conceit, more specifically to the prowling-cat metaphor used to frame those who wish Marlowe ill. The homophony of *Tom*, the metanalysed first syllable of the character name, with the male gender marker for cats, *tom*, insinuates the pressure the recipient of the nickname comes under as a result of the reputation he has acquired. The constant harassment Marlowe is subjected to comes chiefly from those who exploit the bad name he has gained for their own ends rather than those who are genuinely shocked by his alleged atheism. Among the predatory toms that inhabit the night roof top is Walter Raleigh, partially responsible for Marlowe's reputation for atheism, and Ingram Frizer, Marlowe's eventual nemesis. One

of them befriends the dramatist, and the other hounds him to his death: both are identified with Tamburlaine in the narrative.

14.2.2.1. *Tamburlaine Reflected in Walter Raleigh*

In contrast to Marlowe, who is occasionally called *Tamburlaine* but does not identify himself with the character of that name, Raleigh sees in Tamburlaine a reflection of himself despite never being called by the character name. If a scathing contempt of institutional religion is the tie that binds the dramatist to his creation, then the affinity the courtier feels with the character is an indomitable will to power. In the interview after the première performance of *2 Tamburlaine* Raleigh cites "I'll ride in golden armour like the sun" (VI iii 115) to let Marlowe know that he has recognised the line to be an allusion to his "ostentation as Captain of the Queen's guard" [p.125]. His armour, as he admits in the tête-à-tête he invites Marlowe to, "is, in fact, of silver" [p.131], but the line nevertheless catches "my dream of it being gold." The alchemic transmutation of silver into gold symbolises the trajectory of Raleigh's meteoric career, impelled by his driving ambition: silver represents the honour and prestige he has already achieved, and gold the greater power he still strives for. In addition to their "aspiring minds" (*1 Tamburlaine* II vii 20), a common appetite for power and endowment of the rational faculty enabling them to attain it, Raleigh's self-identification with Tamburlaine is prompted by the recognition that have both risen to pre-eminence from humble origins. Echoing the Narrator's description of the hero of Marlowe's play as "[n]o more than a nothingness that rose to universal power through a thrust from within" [p.119], Raleigh says of himself that "I was nothing, one of lowly Devon family that had not even joined in the ennobling pillage of the Reform" [p.128], who has nevertheless become reigning court favourite thanks to sheer individual merit. The moral to be drawn from *Tamburlaine*, according to Raleigh's reading of the play, is that pre-eminence should go to those who have the courage to acknowledge their ambition and the resolve and cunning to realise it, irrespective of their station, and not be determined by birth, as in the case of the traditional peerage, or given as a reward for servile time-serving, as in the case of the nobility created by the Tudor dynasty.

Raleigh's summarising remark that "in your *Tamburlaine* you caught me" prompts Marlowe to demur: "You are unjust to yourself. Tamburlaine is all cruelty" [p.128]. The will to succeed in spite of the odds exemplified by Tamburlaine's rise from brigand chief to emperor of all central Asia is accompanied by a readiness to remove without

contemplation all those who stand in his way. Raleigh, however, acknowledges the concomitant cruelty of his ambition entailed in his self-identification with Tamburlaine:

> —And so am I, of necessity. Machiavelli has unveiled the truth of our natures. The slaughter in Ireland and my cold eyes looking on the massacre of women. You have that in your play.

Drawing on Williamson (1972: 143-6), Burgess has Raleigh suggest that the Smerwick massacre —that is, "[t]he slaughter in Ireland"— is the inspiration of the bloody climax to *1 Tamburlaine*, the desperate plea made by the virgins of Damascus for Tamburlaine to spare their city and his order to put them to the sword (V ii 1-57). The reference to Machiavelli presents the atrocity perpetrated on Raleigh's orders as an application of the precept commonly ascribed to the philosopher that the ends justify the means. Indeed, earlier in the book "Sir Walter Raleigh's massacre of the Irish" [p.69] is cited by Nicholas Faunt as a textbook example of Machiavellian policy: the wholesale killing of "women and children on their knees begging for mercy" is "justified by the need to wage war fast." Raleigh's hedged acknowledgement of his recourse to acts of barbarism to attain his goals reveals him to bear a greater resemblance to Tamburlaine than Marlowe does. The dramatist also aspires to raise himself above the estate he was born into, although his ambitions are poetic rather than military or political; he is also sharp-tongued and quarrelsome, but the tumultuous free-for-alls his gibes and hot-headedness involves him in come nowhere near to the ferocity of Tamburlaine's imaginary and Raleigh's real massacres. As far as cruelty is concerned, then, the answer to the question "[i]s Tamburlaine but the enlargement of [Marlowe]" [p.137] is in the affirmative.

More than for extreme violence, perhaps, Machiavelli has become a byword for double-dealing. Consequently, in invoking the theoretician of *Realpolitik*, Raleigh pleads guilty to duplicity as well as cruelty. The implied admission is borne out by the confirmation of the ambiguous role he plays in the Babington plot on account of his relationship with the ringleader:

> The condemned Babington sent me a thousand pound to speak up for him. I did not so speak but I kept the thousand. I needed all I could get for the Virginia venture [p.129].

Raleigh's duplicity parallels Tamburlaine's reneging on the bargain struck with Cosroe: after defeating the King of Persia, Tamburlaine seizes the throne for himself instead of handing it over to deposed monarch's brother as agreed. The act of treachery is alluded to in Raleigh's "the passionate shepherd riding in triumph through where was it?"

[p.128], a garbled quote of the opening line of the speech in which Tamburlaine begins to toy with the idea of becoming king (*1 Tamburlaine* II ii 50-4).

Raleigh's confession of his unscrupulous conduct is echoed in the cynical maxim that "[t]he wise man takes his money where he can" [p.266], from the sentence of death Nicholas Skeres pronounces on Marlowe. The similarities between the two utterances suggest that Raleigh will, if the occasion demands it, act in as underhand a manner towards Marlowe as he did to Babington. The suggestion is supported, if not corroborated, by Skeres's intimation that Raleigh has his reasons for wanting Marlowe dead:

> you will never know whether it is a knight or an earl who wishes the voiding. (...) One deletes you from life's book as a warning to others (...) The other is afraid of a speaking out under duress that will light the powder of his own ruin [p.266].

If Raleigh can order the massacre of innocent women and children to bring a war to a speedy conclusion, and accept a bribe from a condemned man to provide funding for his business ventures, then it is conceivable that he is perfectly capable of abandoning Marlowe to his fate to ensure his physical survival. In this respect *Tamburlaine* is a more appropriate nickname for Raleigh than it is for Marlowe, not because of the religious heterodoxy the courtier has in common with the dramatist, but because of his willingness to sacrifice others in pursuance of his own ends

14.2.2.2. *Tamburlaine Reflected in Ingram Frizer*

Ambition, ruthlessness and unscrupulousness are traits that Raleigh shares with Ingram Frizer. These traits are deducible from the boast Thomas Walsingham's manservant makes that

> I attain where I am through cleanness. In buying and eke selling. And if there be coneys to be catched – [p.190].

Frizer, like Tamburlaine and Raleigh, has risen from obscurity to social eminence, although through the accumulation of wealth instead of military conquest or service rendered to the Crown. What impels him is neither the quest for military glory nor individual advancement, but acquisitiveness, dignified under the names of industry and thrift. As a gloss on *cleanness*, moreover, buying and selling are held up as activities which not only bring prosperity but also give respectability to those who engage in them. However, the respectability which accrues to those that make good has nothing to do with morality. The elliptic reference to coney-catching is a broad hint that Frizer is

not averse to resorting to sharp practice if the occasion arises, giving to understand that there is nothing disgraceful about it. What counts in business is that the venture pays off, irrespective of the methods employed. Indeed, making good has the power of retroactively transforming venality into initiative and enterprise, much more admirable qualities. In this regard *cleanness* glosses over the legal and moral dubiety of the transactions which go under the rubric of *buying and selling*, including "the dragging of high overdue interest on a loan" [p.210]. Frizer, in the final analysis, is an exponent of Machiavellian policy financially as Tamburlaine and Raleigh are in the military and political spheres. The respectability conferred on him by virtue of his success in usury and shady business deals is another manifestation of the ends justifying the means.

Despite the correspondences between Frizer's financial exploits and Tamburlaine's feats of arms, the loan shark is neither called by the name of *Tamburlaine*, as Marlowe is, nor explicitly identified with the character, as Raleigh is. However, a tenuous link between Frizer and the all-conquering emperor may be uncovered in the sentence "[h]e bowed leaving and limped as he left" [p.48], which marks the end of Marlowe's first encounter with his future murderer. Etymologically, the name *Tamburlaine* is an anglicisation of the Tartar *Timur Lenk*, that is, 'Timur the lame,' the name the historical Tamburlaine was known by (Mellen Wehling 1958: 244). Frizer, then, suffers from the same physical handicap denoted by the epithet attached to the name borne by the Mogul ruler. What is more, *Timur* is Tartar for *iron* (Mellen Wehling 1958: 244), making it an inductive name insomuch as the bearer lives up to the connotations of hardness and strength evoked by the term. The etymology of *Tamburlaine* accordingly connects the lameness suggested by Frizer's limp with the byname via semantically opaque *–laine*, and from there to the inductive name embodied by *Tambur-*. Frizer's ruthlessness, however, inverts the relation between the two terms that make up the etymology of the character name his impediment links him to. Accordingly *lame* might be applied to him as a nickname to characterise him physically, and *iron* as a byname to characterise him morally. The byname would also act as a corrective to the impression of weakness and irresolution created by the nickname, indicating that Frizer is a man not to be trifled with despite the servile demeanour he maintains towards his master. The hypocritical humility and apparent infirmity of the "bawdy serving man" belies a personality as implacable and unrelenting as that of the most virile of Marlowe's creations, although Marlowe himself does not fully realise this until it is too late (see 13.3.2).

No more reference to the limp is made until the tragic denouément of the novel. Just before Marlowe is killed, Skeres asks his accomplices to sit on either side of the former, the man about to kill him being described as "[t]he limping and wincing Frizer" [p.265]. The present participle *limping* contrasts with the verbs descriptive of gait in the fragments, "the great manor house where Ingram Frizer stalked" [p.84] and "prowling Frizer." Both *stalk* and *prowl* connote not only rapacity but also exercise of restraint in that they express movements made with great care so as not to frighten off the prey the hunter is looking for. The verbs therefore define Frizer as a predator that waits for the right moment to pounce on its quarry and can control its first impulse to kill until then. Marlowe's refusal to betray Raleigh signals that the time has finally come to close in for the kill. Yet the killer is described as limping towards his intended victim, a verb connoting awkwardness instead of the contained agility characterising the movement of a predator approaching its cornered prey. Earlier at the Deptford meeting the limp is attributed to the pain caused by a kick Marlowe dealt him the day before, although the clause "feigning a greater pain he could properly have felt in his kicked shin" [p.258] strongly suggests that Frizer's lameness is largely put on. However, the connection of his limp with the etymological meaning of *Tamburlaine* renders the infirmity a harbinger of the vengeance he is about to wreak. Like Tamburlaine, Frizer assumes the role of the scourge of God that rids the world of godless profligates like Marlowe.

Although he dismisses Frizer as one that "may mean harm but lacks the skill to do it" [p.210], Marlowe is from time to time overcome by the presentiment that Walsingham's manservant will kill him one day. As seen in 13.1.3, the mere mention and sight of Frizer is enough to prompts his victim to recite Lightborn's "'Tis not the first time I have kill'd a man" speech. As well as a moment of poetic inspiration, the occurrence of the line is a flash of poetic insight. On one occasion the lines come to him apropos of Frizer's announcement of the imminent death of Walsingham's elder brother and the reward of a stewardship following his master's inheritance of the family estate, a prospect that leads Marlowe to suggest that Frizer is helping Edmund Walsingham on to his death. Although tongue-in-cheek, the suggestion constitutes suspicion, if not recognition, that Frizer is capable of killing man in order to achieve the aims he has set himself. Lightborn's speech is quoted in full when Frizer enters Scadbury bearing news of Francis Walsingham's death, interrupting the rehearsal of *Edward II* Marlowe and Thomas Walsingham are holding [p.200]. As with Tamburlaine, then, death is Frizer's element. Whereas the conqueror deals death, the servant seems only to announce it,

although the identification of the latter with Lightborn implies that he can kill as well. The real difference between Tamburlaine and Frizer is the scale of the killing they are each responsible for. While the former routs whole armies and lays waste entire regions, the latter stabs to death a defenceless man. In any case Frizer's limp, like his obsequiousness, is part of a persona he creates to conceal a more formidable character that Marlowe is intermittently and unconsciously aware of.

14.3. The Identification of Marlowe with Faustus

Faustus, in the jocular form of *Dr Forster*, names the private Marlowe,

> Whose fiendful fortune may exhort the wise
> Only to wonder at unlawful things,
> Whose deepness doth entice such forward wits,
> To practise more than heavenly power permits
> (*Doctor Faustus* Epilogue 5-8).

The "unlawful things" the Chorus refers to is echoed by "such unlawful knowing" the Narrator makes reference to in the prologue to the book. As seen in 6.1.2 and 6.3.2, its polysemy enables *knowing* to mean simultaneously 'acquaintance with a person,' 'knowledge acquired through learning' and 'anal intercourse' when the nominalised verb is applied to Marlowe. The intertextual frame provided by *Doctor Faustus* identifies his acquaintance with Walter Raleigh, the application of his learning to the analysis of received and incontestable truths and his sexual orientation as factors that contribute to Marlowe's downfall. As regards the second of the three factors enumerated, one may add the secrets he is privy to concerning the objectives and methods of the Service to the "Godless talk" that Greene presumes to proceed at Durham House [p.147]. This would identify his association with Raleigh and his set as the pretext for Marlowe's death, whereas the reason for the murder is his refusal to pass on to the Service compromising information about his patron, confirming the misgivings his colleagues have regarding his reliability, and prompting them to take action against him before he can give them away. The Faustian frame of Kit's tragedy presents Marlowe as an object of contention between two rival forces embodied by Durham House and Seething Lane. Just as Faustus' insatiable appetite for knowledge causes him to turn his back on God and ignore the appeals to repent, so Marlowe's intellectual curiosity draws him away from the Service to the Raleigh circle while his loyalty to its president causes him to ignore the demands to incriminate him. What the

parallels between Faustus and Marlowe do not clarify is whether Seething Lane and Durham House are to be identified with heaven and hell respectively or vice versa.

14.3.1. Parallels between Doctor Faustus *and Kit's Tragedy*

In *Doctor Faustus* the error of judgement which brings about the eventual destruction of the hero is the episode in which he signs away his soul for twenty-four years of unlimited pleasure and knowledge (I v 94-104). In *A Dead Man in Deptford* the equivalent of Faustus' pact with the Devil is Marlowe's affixing his signature to the written oath of allegiance on joining the Service. The infernal overtones of his commitment are brought out by the description of Francis Walsingham's intent stare as he compels his new recruit to sign: "And he fixed on Kit stern eyes black as hell's hobs" [p.27]. The resonances of the bargain Faustus strikes with the Devil in the swearing-in of Marlowe identifies Seething Lane with hell, and its agents with the evil spirits that constantly visit the scholar to remind him of his agreement, alluded to by the noun phrase *hell's hobs* in that the pre-modifier brings out the archaic meaning of the head, 'sprite or goblin' (OED VII 1989: 274). Throughout his career as a spy Marlowe, like his creation, will suffer agonies of doubt over the wisdom of what he has committed himself to; and in the end the Service will reclaim him, just as Lucifer reclaims Faustus' soul. Indeed, the last words Skeres addresses to Marlowe are "[u]gly hell, gape not, come not, Lucifer" [p.267], the last but one line from Faustus' final soliloquy uttered as the devils are about to drag him off to hell (*Doctor Faustus* V ii 199).

Along with the contractual agreement with the Devil, the final soliloquy is one of the easiest allusions to *Doctor Faustus* to spot, especially the line "See, see, where Christ's blood runs in the firmament" (V ii 157), referred or alluded to at three points in the narrative. The first reference is the result of an epiphany Marlowe experiences on seeing the setting sun under the influence of a spill of tobacco he has just smoked:

> he opened the window to a raging November sunset. *Streams in the firmament* came to him and he grinned sadly at the division of brain and body [p.132].

The line is reported by Thomas Hariot in one of the sessions Marlowe attends at Durham House:

> Why did the flue of my arms start up when Faustus cried that he saw Christ's blood stream in the firmament [p.156]?

It is evoked for the third time, through the figure of speech of apophasis, or affirmation through denial (Cuddon 1979: 52), when Marlowe meets up with Thomas Walsingham at Deptford prior to their departure for Edinburgh:

> Christ's blood, no, not Christ's blood, streamed in the firmament, only the colours of the autumn day bravely dying, a sweet sad swansong sung to no ear [p.180].

What connects the passages these three extracts are taken from is that they all represent portentous turning points in Marlowe's life. First, the spill of tobacco he smokes, Raleigh's parting gift after their tête-à-tête (see 14.2.1), signals that he has been invited to join the Raleigh set, as a taste for tobacco is one of the emblems that identify a member of the courtier's circle. Next, Hariot's expression of his perplexity at his response to hearing the line from Faustus' speech is the starting point for a rational enquiry into the question of Christ's divinity, resulting in Raleigh's ill-starred commission to have Marlowe copy the anti-Arian tract for future discussion on the subject (see 14.1.2). Finally, the first Deptford meeting marks Marlowe's resumption of government service, as the Edinburgh mission is the first assignment he is given after he is bailed out of Newgate (see 9.3), as well as the renewal of his relationship with his estranged lover. As an externalisation of Faustus' anguish at the imminence of his damnation, the soliloquy alluded to adds a premonitory note to each passage: each turning point brings Marlowe nearer to his own destruction, particularly evident in the third citation of the line thanks to the direct references to death it contains. What merits notice about the allusions is that Faustus' valedictory speech yokes together Marlowe's association with Raleigh and the Service, identifying the tension set up by his double allegiance as the driving force behind the dynamic of his tragic downfall.

14.3.1.1. *Parallels between Marlowe and Faustus*

The identification of Marlowe's entry into government service with Faustus' diabolic contract effectively makes the Marlovian rendering of the Faust legend the interpretative frame through which the poet-playwright's life may be read. The parallel is particularly noticeable in the closing paragraph of the first part of the novel, which describes Marlowe's graduation:

> for now, gowned and hooded as *magister*, mark that, *artium*, of arts a master, proceeding to music, M.A., he might begin a few years of achieve and mastery, bringing to the playhouse the firm ground or pinning of his learnedness matched to his own fire, yet in a few years, alas, a very few, alas alas, a very very few [p.113].

The regret conveyed by the clause introduced by adversative *yet* poignantly counteracts the triumphalism of the preceding clause. The incremental repetition of the noun phrase *a few years* —aided and foregrounded by the gradation of the adjective on the one hand, and on the other by the insertion of the poetic interjection of grief and pity before each succeeding phrase— serves to underscore and remind the reader of the brevity of Marlowe's brilliant career, thereby bringing to mind the twenty-four-year period of grace vouchsafed to Faustus, an infinitesimal span of time compared to an eternity of damnation. Marlowe is implicitly likened to the scholar-magician in that he also lives on borrowed time that runs out more swiftly than each has bargained for.

The emphasis on the little time granted to Marlowe in which to develop his artistic potential counterpoints the arrested incremental repetition of his academic title in the first clause. As with the transience of Marlowe's literary eminence, the references to his master's degree highlight his academic achievement; and in doing so, it draws attention to other correspondences with Faustus. In the prologue to *Doctor Faustus* the Chorus give a thumbnail sketch of the hero's infancy and academic career,

> Now is he born, of parents base of stock,
> In Germany, within a town called Rhodes.
> At riper years to Wittenberg he went,
> Whereas his kinsmen brought him up.
> So much he profits in divinity,
> The fruitful plot of scholarism graced,
> That shortly he was graced with Doctor's name,
> Excelling all; and sweetly can dispute
> In th'heavenly matters of theology
> (10-19),

which closely parallels Marlowe's own: "a cobbler's son" from Canterbury "committed (...) to the tedious study of theology" awarded his degree through the intervention of the Privy Council. After mentioning Faustus' skill as a disputant, the tone of the prologue also switches from admiration to regret, though with an element of disapproval missing from the Narrator's evocation of the ceremony at which Marlowe receives his degree:

> Till swol'n with cunning of a self-conceit,
> His waxen wings did mount above his reach,
> And melting, heavens conspired his overthrow
> (20-2).

More than expressing compunction for his downfall, the Chorus deplore Faustus' wilful misuse of the outstanding intellectual gifts outlined before on "cursed necromancy"

(*Doctor Faustus* Prologue 25), a consequence of an overweening pride bred by his erudition.

Having introduced the hero of the tragedy about to unfold, extolling his scholarship while lamenting the evil use it is put to, the Chorus sets the scene for the first act at the end of their prologue, "[a]nd this the man that in his study sits." In *A Dead Man in Deptford* the passage from the prologue to the chronicle proper is signalled by the ostensive utterance "[w]ell then, let us have him at Cambridge" [p.5], which occupies the same liminal position as the last line of the Chorus. What follows, Marlowe's irreverent baiting of his fellow students and dismissal of Francis Kett's mysticism (see 5.1.1), echoes Faustus' review the subjects that make up the canon of traditional learning (*Doctor Faustus* I i 1-48). After going through, and rejecting, the gamut of scholastic learning, Faustus turns from divinity to magic, perceived as a more fitting subject for his mind, a decision that leads to his devil's pact and ultimate damnation. Marlowe forsakes theology for poetry, a calling that the poet-spy Thomas Watson uses as a snare to catch a new recruit for Francis Walsingham, leading to Marlowe's induction into the Service and his eventual death at Deptford. The Faustian theme running through the Narrator's memoir is closely associated with Marlowe's secret career as a government agent.

Another final parallel between *A Dead Man in Deptford* and *Doctor Faustus* is the role of commentator on the action shared by the Narrator and the Chorus. What distinguishes the former from the latter is his refusal to moralise. As seen above, in the Prologue the Chorus censures Faustus for his foolish as well as wicked obsession with magic. In the Epilogue the exhortation to see in Faustus' "hellish fall" awaiting those who "practise more than heavenly power permits" makes his tragedy an *exemplum*, a story told to illustrate a moral (Cuddon 1979: 250). In the Narrator's epilogue, by contrast, the tone is one of vindication rather than commination: "The England that killed Kit Marlowe or Marley or Merlin will define itself in one of its facets by what he wrote before he died swearing" [p.269]. That is, posterity will recognise Marlowe as the poet and dramatist whose work captured the spirit of his age instead of the iconoclast that sought to undermine the cultural values of the times. If *Doctor Faustus* is a cautionary tale about what comes of going beyond circumscribed knowledge, then *A Dead Man in Deptford* is the edifying tale of daring to add to the store of knowledge by bringing to bear new and challenging perspectives to received truths.

14.3.1.2. *Marlowe's Devils*

Doctor Faustus is in essence a morality play, a dramatisation of the contention of the forces of good and evil over the human soul (Cuddon 1979: 402-3). Both before and after Faustus signs away his soul, the good and evil angels strive to persuade him to repudiate and honour his contract respectively; and Faustus himself undergoes violent swings of mood, fluctuating between a firm resolve to honour his agreement and damn the consequences and grave doubts as to the probity of what he has done and great fear as to the fate awaiting him. What keeps him from reneging on his deal is the constant attentions of Mephistophilis, Faustus' familiar spirit, who alternately threatens and cajoles his charge into compliance. After entering the Service, Marlowe is constantly visited by his colleagues, sent with the mission to ascertain whether he is keeping faith and stop him from backsliding. Like Faustus Marlowe is kept in line by means of the carrot-and-stick approach, namely Thomas Walsingham's sexual favours and veiled threats as to what will fall out if he decides to break faith with the Service.

The first visitation is that of Marlowe's friend and mentor Thomas Watson. They make each other's acquaintance as a result of a street brawl which interrupts the flow of blasphemies Marlowe was uttering to rile the other undergraduates, a coincidence that recalls Faustus' conjuration of Mephistophilis (I iii 16-24). Conjuring evil spirits involves using, or misusing, sacred names (Roberts 2000: 69), on account of which the temporal relation between Marlowe's impious references to New Testament characters [p.6] and Watson's arrival may be read as a causal one. Watson appears because he has been adjured to. Whether bidden to appear or not, he soon realises that the young undergraduate with a flair for versifying has no vocation for the ministry and immediately sets about playing on Marlowe's ennui to talk him into joining the Service. In this respect Watson's behaviour is comparable to Mephistophilis': the promise of money, a chance to see the world and scope to develop his poetic genius is a ploy to hasten on the moment of enlistment. The demoniac associations are suggested by Watson's swarthiness, conveyed by "black eyes" [p.10], and black garb, "slit doublet, black velvet over, gold silk under." His dark complexion links him to his master Francis Walsingham, described as "a frail dark man (…) called the Moor" [p.26] with "eyes black as hell's hobs" [p.27]. Other members of the Service are distinguished by their swarthiness as well, notably Nicholas Skeres, as evidenced by "his black eyes on Kit" [p.41] and "Kit looked up into the black eyes of (…) Skeres" [p.92], and Nicholas Faunt, who is "dark of eye and skin and beard like Walsingham his master" [p.69]. The

black hobs, or demons, Walsingham's eyes are compared to are to be identified with the agents the spymaster employs[54].

Besides dark complexion, a feature that not all Walsingham's servants bear, their diabolic character is inscribed in the names they bear. One example of this, the likening of Skeres to the Devil by virtue of the familiar name *Nick*, has already been dealt with at some length in 12.2.2.2. By same token Richard Baines's invitation to use the familiar style of address in "[a]nd on the quay indeed was Baines, Dick Baines" [p.105] may carry demoniac connotations. Together with *Old Nick*, the pet name *Dickens*, formed by adding the non-productive diminutive suffix *–ens* (Reaney et al. 1997 [1958]: 134), is used in euphemistic invocations of the Devil (OED IV 1989: 621). The diabolical associations are assisted by the near-homophony of the family name with *bane*, the noun denoting a continual cause of trouble or unhappiness, and the stem of the adjective *baneful*, a synonym of *evil*. Forever keeping tabs on Marlowe and traducing everything he says, Baines is one of the many banes in the dramatist's life In addition to what the associations the name evokes, Baines's "I think much on Christ" [p.109] and "I think much on Jesus Christ" [p.164] echo Mephostophilis' injunction to "[t]hink on hell, Faustus, for thou art damned" (*Doctor Faustus* II i 75), underwritten by Belzebub's prohibition "[t]hou shouldst not think on God" and Lucifer's admonition "[t]hink on the devil" (II i 95-6). The identical syntactic frame Baines and Mephistophilis, Belzebub and Lucifer use insinuates the insincerity of the former's profession of piety. The avowal that he always has Christ on his mind is meant to prompt Marlowe to make an irreverent remark that can be taken down and used to incriminate him. Like the Devil, Baines is a liar and equivocator so that the testimony he may give is accepted at the interlocutor's peril. The association of the Devil with lying is evoked in the scornful welcome Marlowe extends to Baines on seeing him after his dismissal from the hearing he has been summonsed to: "The devils of the plague know their own" [p.246]. As Baines is about to hand in a highly tendentious dossier on Marlowe which will prejudice his interrogators against its subject, the phrasing of the sarcastic commendation of Baines's immunity from the bubonic plague raging in London identifies the informer as one of the evil spirits which have been dogging him.

[54] The identification of swarthiness with the forces of darkness is made in "The Most Beautified," a short story included in Burgess's *The Devil's Mode* (1989) and inspired by the conjuration of Helen of Troy (*Doctor Faustus* V ii 88-103): there Mephistophilis is described as having "a pair of black eyes whose pupils attenuated to needle points" [p.31].

Mendacity is a trait Baines has in common with Robert Poley. As his handling of the Babington plotters clearly shows, Poley is the most dangerous of Walsingham's agents because he is the most plausible as well as the most treacherous, and therefore most to be distrusted when he appears to be telling the truth. Of all the government agents he is the most deserving of the sobriquet *the father of lies*, one of the titles bestowed on Satan in the New Testament (John 8: 44). Poley's satanic nature, at least as regards his duplicity, is also related to his name: *hob* is derived from *Hob*, the rhymed alternate to the end-clipped familiar form of *Robert* (Reaney et al. 1997 [1958]: 233). His insistence on being *Robin* may therefore be considered as another indication of Poley's slippery character: by having others call him by the pet name, the devilish associations of *Hob* are avoided, allowing him more leeway to practise his deceit. This onomastic sleight-of-hand is aided by the fact that both *Hob* and *Robin* is a stock name for a boorish rustic or clown (OED VII 1989: 274), and by extension a simpleton, hinted at in the introductory description of Poley at Dover, more specifically in the sentence "[t]he face cheerful, guileless even, as if he had shunted guile on to Skeres" [p.42][55]. As explained in 12.1.2, the ambiguity of *even* indicates that the character described is not as naïve as he seems, or gives out to be. The galumphing and uncouth connotations of *Robin* conspire with the bearer's foppish appearance and affable demeanour to conceal a cold-blooded schemer.

Ingram Frizer, too, is identifiable as one of the brood of devils that take turns in hounding Marlowe, although such identification can only be made indirectly. To begin with, Frizer is the only character of relevance whose exterior is not fully detailed. The one physical characteristic that is given, his limp, links him to Tamburlaine, described as "devilish" by Cosroe (*1 Tamburlaine* II vi 1), and by Ortygius as a "fiend," "spirit of the earth," "monster turned into manly shape" and "a devilish thief" (II vi 15-20). As regards his dress, the Narrator says of him on one occasion that "Frizer was as always in sober black" [p.189], which links him to Skeres, described on another occasion as being "in decent black as for mourning" [p.92], which in turn refers back to the Machiavelli of the prologue to *The Jew of Malta*, "on the stage in black" [p.23] and whose lines are also described as "devilish" (see 12.2.2.2). Frizer, then, is a devil by association: via Skeres, whose demonic character is announced by his swarthiness and the satanic

[55] *Robin* and *Dick* are the names borne by two of the clowns in *Doctor Faustus* whose antics act as a comic foil to the magic Faustus works. Poley himself seems to have them in mind when he rebukes Marlowe's wilfully misunderstanding the drift of what he is telling him: "I like thy wit well i'faith, as the clowns say. I have seen plays, even yours of Faustus and the devil" [p.176]. On this occasion Poley apparently wishes to dissociate himself from the associations of clowning carried by the name he wants to be called by.

overtones of *Nick*, and via Tamburlaine, who is demonised by his enemies on account of his invincibility. What establishes his diabolic identity is Frizer's identification with Lightborn. In 14.2.2.2, primed from the discussion of the intertextual frame provided by *Edward II* in 13.1.3, it was argued that the murderer of Edward II is modelled on the future murderer of Marlowe to the extent to which the lines given to the character are inspired by its exemplar. The name *Lightborn*, which alternates with *Lightborne* in the Tucker Brooke edition of *Edward II* (1910: 377-82), is a calque on *Lucifer*, the name of the angel that rose up against God (Levin 1961: 124; Weil 1977: 147; Hopkins 2000: 126). The lines he inspires therefore identify Frizer as a demon as well as Marlowe's nemesis. Accordingly, the line Skeres quotes from Faustus' damnation soliloquy is confirmation of Marlowe's unconscious identification of his murderer with Lucifer: the referent of vocative *Lucifer* is not the prince of hell, but Frizer, who is advancing on his victim dagger in hand the instant the quotation is made. In an act of mocking empathy Skeres sees the killing from Marlowe's angle of vision and, in citing "come not, Lucifer," gives the doomed man his last words.

The identification of Marlowe's colleagues in the Service with the devils that constantly appear, disappear and re-appear in the course of Faustus' downward slide to eternal damnation is established in two ways. The first is through the dark complexion some of them share with Francis Walsingham, the arch-fiend, as is the case of Watson and Faunt; and the second is through the associations carried by their names, as is the case of Baines, Poley and Frizer: in the case of Skeres it is through both his swarthiness and the stigmatisation undergone by *Nick*, the name he goes by. Swarthiness, however, is not limited to Walsingham's agents. Father Ballard is described as "black-bearded, black of eye" [p.59], which would make him another of the diabolic agents that covet Marlowe's soul. At the drinking party in Rheims the priest makes an attempt to win Marlowe over to his cause, a bid frustrated by the timely appearance of Thomas Walsingham (see 9.2.2.1). In view of the identification of Seething Lane with hell, Ballard is to be equated with the Good Angel that tries to win Faustus back for God. Yet his physical resemblance to Francis Walsingham, Watson, Skeres and Faunt blurs the clear-cut distinction between the benign and malign spirits that work for the hero's salvation or damnation in *Doctor Faustus*. In the cut and thrust of religious dissension no such distinction can be drawn. Catholic and Protestant denigrate one another so that it is impossible to tell who is right and who wrong, and both denominations take the short way with their adversaries so that it may be said that the one is as bad as the other.

Marlowe's tragedy, then, differs from Faustus' in that there is no good angel to counsel him. Both the forces pitted against one another are of the Devil's party despite their respective claims that they are carrying out God's will. Another, more marked difference is that Marlowe forfeits his salvation, in the form of his self-preservation, because he does not keep his side of the bargain. In spite of the broad hints that it is in his interest to betray Raleigh, a more successful contender for his soul than Ballard, Marlowe refuses to satisfy the demand imposed by the Service to do so, a refusal perceived as a definitive breach of faith, prompting them to eliminate him so as to forestall prospective disloyalty on his part. As Skeres says prior to the killing, "we speak not of treachery but of its possibility" [p.266], a possibility raised by Marlowe's unlicensed bid to opt out. In his case Lucifer appears not so much to collect his due as punish Marlowe from withholding it from him.

14.3.1.3. *Faustus' Damnation Soliloquy as a Frame*

The parallels traced between the Narrator's memoir and the tragedy of Doctor Faustus is principally bound up with Marlowe's activities as a government spy. Faustus' damnation soliloquy focuses on the divided loyalties which torment Marlowe in the wake of his willing co-option into the Raleigh circle and unwilling return to government service, and which eventually precipitate the crisis resulting in Marlowe's death. Both events are inauspiciously heralded by references to the line comparing the light of the setting sun to the shedding of Christ's blood, identifying the combined consequences of each as factors determining the playwright-spy's fate.

To begin with, Marlowe's association with Durham House is concurrent with a period in which he seems to have severed all connection with Seething Lane. At the initiatory interview with Raleigh it comes out that Marlowe has left the Service: "I thought you were with Walsingham, no, they said you had left his employ" [p.130]. The probationary gathering of the Raleigh circle also coincides with the rupture of his relations with Thomas Walsingham. While at the beginning of session Raleigh refers to the new member as "[o]ur new friend Merlin" [p.137], Marlowe is refused admittance to Scadbury the next time he goes there, apparently with his beloved's knowledge: "Then the great door slammed, and was it Tom's laughter he soon heard?" [p.141]. If, as it is suggested in 7.3.4, the task allotted to the spymaster's cousin is to decoy Marlowe, the latter's quitting the Service puts an end to the mission entrusted to the younger Walsingham, which in turn moves him to break off their relationship.

If the sexual allure Walsingham holds for him is what keeps Marlowe from leaving the Service, then what brings him to Durham House is as much his addiction to tobacco as the quality of the conversation the visitors there engage in. What smoking has in common with anal sex is that they satisfy appetites deemed as unnatural: the one does not provide nourishment, and the other does not engender progeny. Their perceived unnaturalness makes for the equation of both activities, such as Raleigh's observation "[a]s (...) the love of boys is the higher refinement of coupling (...), so with tobacco eating and drinking are refined to an essence beyond the reach of gross nutriment" [p.127], crudely summarised as "the buggery of the lungs" [p.132]. The association of smoking with paederastry is reinforced in the Narrator's report of Marlowe's habit of smoking while having sex with him, "he would pleasure his lungs with the nymph while he indulged the satyr in his loins" [p.143], and lexicalised in the derogatory nickname his acquaintances think up: "[s]ome (...) spoke of Mr TS, the tobacco sodomite." The references to this association all allude to the thirteenth item on the Baines note, namely the quip attributed to Marlowe that "all they that love not tobacco & Boyes were fooles" (quoted in Steane 1965: 364). The fifteenth item, that "the sacrament [of the eucharist] (...) would haue bin much better being administered in a Tobacco pipe," is also alluded to in

> [i]f Christ had known it, would he have transmitted his substance in smoke? The eucharist in a pipe bowl? He saw Christ an instant, smiling, bending no angry brows[56] [pp.132-3],

thereby compounding heresy with aberrant sexuality under the perverse habit of smoking tobacco. Along with heterodoxy and homosexuality, smoking is identified with devil worship, particularly in the wake of the moral panic caused by *Doctor Faustus*. In the popular mind tobacco smoke is transmuted into the "black fumes" of a fancied black mass, and the smell of tobacco is referred to on one occasion as "the devil's incense" [p.160]. Marlowe's newly acquired habit conjures up the image of the "infernal trio of" the sorcerer, sodomite and heretic (Bray 1982: 19) which he has come to exemplify. As part of his initiation into the Raleigh circle, moreover, the acquisition of the habit identifies Durham House with hell insofar as tobacco is used as means of enticing Marlowe there. Raleigh, then, emerges as a tempter, and therefore a demon figure. If Thomas Walsingham tempts Marlowe in the flesh, Raleigh tempts him in the spirit, his

[56] The benevolent image of Christ in Marlowe's pipe dream contrasts with the vengeful image of God in the line from Faustus' soliloquy it echoes: "And see where God stretcheth out his arm,/And *bends his ireful brows* (*Doctor Faustus* V ii 161-2 [emphasis added]).

rationality and tobacco being the snares he sets to draw his victim into his orbit. Having become addicted to tobacco, Marlowe becomes dependent on Raleigh because the latter is the only person that can cater for the addiction he has induced his protégé to form. Marlowe's dependence on Raleigh mirrors his emotional servitude to Walsingham, balancing his craving for tobacco against his desire for Walsingham.

The contest between addiction and sex is reminiscent of the debate between the Good and Evil Angel over Faustus' soul, with Walsingham playing the part of the Good Angel. En route to Edinburgh he pointedly remarks on how unattractive he now finds Marlowe:

> —Your body does not smell as it did. There is a rankness.
> —Suffused with love of my nymph tobacco.
> —Yes, you are one of Raleigh's tribe. Raleigh must be on guard.
> —This he knows.
> —You will be safe with me.
> —Am I in danger?
> —If Raleigh cannot be easily struck, others may be in manner of warning. Come then [p.182].

Walsingham's purported concern for Marlowe's safety suggests the Good Angel's plea to "[a]bjure this magic, turn to God again" (*Doctor Faustus* I v 8), *magic* here referring the scientific temper that reigns in Durham House, and *God* to Seething Lane. The address "[c]ome then" is an invitation to have sex, equivalent to the "means to bring thee unto heaven" which the Good Angel assures Faustus contrition, prayer and repentance to be (*Doctor Faustus* I v 17-8). Marlowe's smoking habit is brought to the fore in the notification of his dismissal from Scadbury:

> Well, we have tortured each over the years, though to the end of pleasure. And you torture my nose and gullet with your damnable pipes.
> —You have not said this before.
> —You have not listened or, listening, taken notice. Much may be pardoned in a poet. I shall not be stifled with it again. At least not here [p.248].

The hint that Marlowe is to leave soon reproduces the substance if not the tone of the Old Man's sorrowful farewell to Faustus after his last-ditch attempt to persuade him to repent:

> I leave thee, but with grief of heart,
> Fearing the ruin of thy hopeless soul
> (*Doctor Faustus* V i 67-8).

Marlowe's tart observation that "[y]ou smile, smirk or leer at the prospect" [p.249] indicates that it is not "grief of heart" that Walsingham feels at the prospect of his

dismissed lover's impending ruin. Robert Poley's impertinent greeting at Deptford, "[f]ie, what a stink. There is a Raleigh smell about. Ah, yes, Kit" [p.259], also gives to understand that Marlowe's fate is as good as sealed. From his point of view the meeting at Widow Bull's is a last shot at turning Marlowe against Raleigh, with very little probability of success. Poley's pessimism is confirmed: his half-hearted offer to spare Marlowe in return for his betrayal of Raleigh is turned down, and the playwright is murdered because of his obduracy.

At the heart of his conflict with the Service after rejoining is Marlowe's association with Raleigh. Poley sees Marlowe as a potential infiltrator in the Raleigh circle who can pass on to him compromising information about them in return for his protection and has him eliminated when he realises that his would-be mole will not go along with the scheme. As indicated at the beginning of this sub-section, the consequences of Marlowe's loyalty to Raleigh are prefigured by the references to Faustus' damnation soliloquy in the passages depicting the dramatist's habituation to smoking and his reunion with Walsingham after returning to espionage. The first episode dwells on the agony caused by Marlowe's first experience with smoking, compared to the torments of hell awaiting Faustus. His initial repugnance to tobacco, described as "most diabolical," brings on a bout of vomiting that conjures up a "vision of hell" and provokes a "wrenching and tearing of the inner self," as though he were being "assailed by demons" [p.131]. Faustus, as the Scholars discover at the end of his tragedy (*Doctor Faustus* V iii 6-7), is torn apart by the spirits that come for him. Besides vomiting, the violent reaction to tobacco causes an attack of diarrhoea so that Marlowe "must needs sit bare-arsed on his jordan," a parodic echo of the question "Faustus, must thou needs be damned?" (I v 1), asked before the scholar enters into his pact with the Devil, and the affirmative answer "Faustus must be damned" (V ii 156), given as he sees the sun go down on his final day. It is when Marlowe leaves his lodgings to empty the chamber pot he has just vomited and defecated into that he experiences an epiphany on viewing the "raging November sunset." The vision not only inspires the line for Faustus' speech, it also adumbrates, through the fate of his creation, what the future has in store for Marlowe if he accepts Raleigh's invitation to join his circle. The allusions to the damnation soliloquy with which the vignette is peppered function as a frame that enables the passage to be read as an intimation of Marlowe's tragic destiny. The scatological gives way to the eschatological.

The prophetic character of the vision becomes more apparent the second time Marlowe experiences it. The raging November sunset of the first occasion is now rendered as "the colours of the autumn day bravely dying," the reference to the season tracing the connection between the two epiphanies, as the month mentioned in the first episode is in autumn. The participal clause *bravely dying* brings out the funereal connotations carried by *autumn*, the term that names the season associated with old age and the imminence of death. Both the present participle and the adverb modifying it evoke the approach of death singly, although to see how the latter term does so it is necessary to turn to the murder scene in *Edward II*. After murdering the King, Lightborn solicits Matrevis and Gurney's praise for his skill with the negative question "was it not bravely done?" (V vi 118). In the light of the murderer's choice of *bravely* to describe the taking of Edward's life, the modification of *dying* by the same adverb suggests that the death of the autumn day points to as well as symbolises a premeditated killing. That the second vision comes to him while he and Walsingham "walked together on the crackling dead leaves of the garden of Eleanor Bull's house" [p.180] identifies Marlowe as the victim of the killing revealed in the light of the setting sun. The house will be the scene of his own death, plotted and carried out by three men in a room, and mirrored by the death of Edward II in a dungeon at the hands of three men. The premonition is reinforced by "no, not Christ's blood." At one level the negation cuts short Marlowe's poeticising vision of the sunset, to attribute the redness of the skies to the reflection of the light of sun on the clouds instead of blood. At another level the vision is maintained, but the blood that he fancies seeing is not Christ's. As the blood that will be shed in Deptford is his own, what Marlowe sees in the dusk skies is a quickly stifled revelation of his own death. On this reading, an alternative to the reformulation that follows the negation might be "but Christopher's blood," aided by the inclusion of *Christ* in *Christopher*.

If the first vision links Marlowe's death to his imminent admission into the Raleigh circle, the second relates it to his connection with the Service. Among the intimations of death that abound in the passage recounting his reunion with Walsingham, there is the apposition which rounds off Marlowe's truncated epiphany: "a sweet sad swansong sung to no ear." The head of the phrase refers back to his swearing an oath of allegiance on joining the Service for the first time: "[s]o Kit dubiously signed with a swan feather and ink as black as the gaze of him who was to be his master" [p.27]. The repetition of *swan* suggests a type-antitype relation between the token appearances of the item

whereby *swansong* retroactively invests *swan feather* with a meaning of future calamity by virtue of the sense of finality conveyed by the compound noun. In signing up for the Service, Marlowe seals his own doom, intimated by the dubiety with which he affixes his signature: a grim fate that begins to take shape with his first visit to Eleanor Bull's. Certain details of Walsingham's appearance and demeanour point to the implication of the Service in Marlowe's death, in particular the apparently insignificant surmise concerning the origin of Walsingham's travelling bag in "[h]is bag was of new leather, perhaps Florence work" [p.180]. The mention of the city in which the bag might have been manufactured may not be entirely innocent, given its association with the Medicis and Machiavelli and the stereotype of Italians as unprincipled schemers. Accordingly, *work* can refer to the underhand activity Walsingham and Marlowe are presently engaged in as well as the workmanship which has gone into the making of the bag. However, "[h]e showed no surprise at Kit's coming; the disclosure of travelling companion had been one-sided," in contrast to "[i]t was with some surprise and no surprise (...) that he found Tom Walsingham to be his fellow voyager" [pp.179-80], suggests that Marlowe is more a dupe than a comrade, to be kept in the dark until the final moment. In the light of the Service's mistrust, Walsingham's assurance that his newly-reunited friend "will be safe with me" can be construed as a warning of the consequences of his friendship with Raleigh, "others may be [struck down]" insinuating not only that it is Marlowe that may be struck down, but also that it will be the Service that will strike him down. This not only indicates that Walsingham is aware that the Service considers the elimination of Marlowe as an option: it also gives rise to the suspicion that he has a hand in it when it finally comes to pass. First, he leads Marlowe to the scene of his future murder, which is committed by his manservant, making him a murderer by proxy. On this reading, Walsingham's elusion of responsibility for the killing of his lover constitutes a piece of Florence work worthy of Machiavelli's followers.

The second reference to Faustus' damnation soliloquy adverts to the closer proximity to Marlowe's death. This is brought about first by recasting *raging November sunset* as *the colours of the autumn day bravely dying*. Both *raging* and *bravely dying* present the passage from day to night as a struggle; the adjective suggests an outcome still in the balance, and the participal clause a losing battle. The descriptive content of *dying* marks a shift within the agonic terms in which the sunset is described, emphasising agony as the suffering of the vanquished day in its death throes at the expense of agony as the

struggle of the day against the encroaching night. This impression is bolstered by the more or less direct references to death in the passage: “the smell of (...) distant offal in the slaughteryard,” and a “cousin dying and a brother dying” [p.180]. Less direct are the references to Marlowe’s death, although these are missing altogether in the first reference to soliloquy. While in the tobacco-smoking episode the references are to Faustus’ rather than Marlowe’s end, in the reunion-episode the latter’s death is broadly alluded to by the house in which he will be murdered. Finally, the framing of the tobacco-smoking episode by the damnation soliloquy is weighted towards Raleigh’s role in Marlowe’s death, whereas the reunion-episode discreetly plays up the involvement of the Service, especially Walsingham’s ambivalent part in the killing. In the final analysis, Marlowe’s tragedy is set in motion by signing two incompatible pacts with the devil: one with Seething Lane, and the other with Durham House; in honouring the latter, he reneges on the former, bringing down on himself their vengeance for his breach of faith.

14.3.2. Allusions to the Damnation Soliloquy through Paronomasia

In its first application the intertextual frame provided by the damnation soliloquy highlights Marlowe’s waywardness, the defining feature of his character negatively referred to by his acquaintances as discretion. Smoking is quickly associated with deviant sexuality, through its equation with anal intercourse, and deviant religious opinions, through the half-baked idea of administering the Eucharist through a tobacco pipe. In its second application Faustus’s speech throws into relief Marlowe’s vulnerability, the consequence of his indiscretion. The allusion to Faustus’ impending damnation, assisted by the abundant references to death, presages the violent end Marlowe will come to at Eleanor Bull’s, to a large extent brought on by the dramatist’s perverseness. The two traits the tobacco-smoking and reunion episodes bring to the fore are each embodied in separate avatars of the feline conceit which characterises Marlowe: the wandering-cat metaphor, symbol of his errancy, and the drowning-cat metaphor, emblem of the fatefulness of his errancy, sexual as well as intellectual.

In 4.3.2 it was argued that the homophony between the noun *kitticat* and the nonce sobriquet *Kitticat* in

4. It is a kind of courage but as much may be said of the kitticat cast into the tub for drowning that swims and swims [p.28]
5. Kitticat, Meg said, the Reverend Kitticat, mender of men’s souls [p.39]

transfers the frailty and impotence of the kitten to Marlowe. In [4] *drowning* and *swims* identify water as the means by which Francis Walsingham's imaginary cat is to be killed. The relation between water and Marlowe's death is evoked in

83. Kit, the very sound of dripping, kit kit kit [p.70],

characterised by the homophonous relation between the familiar name *Kit* and each of the elements making up onomatopoeic *kit kit kit*. The relation is more complete in

26. Which is Kit, so you are Kit, come Kit, Kit, Kit [p.32]
    Come then, Kit, Kit, Kit, you see I have remembered the name [p.48]
    It is all very simple, Kit Kit Kit [p.49]
    Oh Kit Kit Kit, you know where
27. Kit Kit Kit, you will never be free [p.189]

on account of the exact numerical correspondence between the token appearances of vocative *Kit* and its non-onomastic co-homophone. Excerpt [83] owes its relevance to the fact that, when seen in its co-text, it contains a recondite allusion to Faustus's damnation soliloquy, and by implication Marlowe's death, linking his demise to his association with Raleigh. The phonological relation of the onomatopoeia in [83] with the triple vocatives in [26] and [27], already discussed in 9.3.1 with regard to the use of familiar style as a means of dominating Marlowe, bears on the responsibility of Thomas Walsingham and Robert Poley in his death, as they are the respective sources of [26] and [27]. The suggestion of water in turn relates [83], and by extension [26] and [27], to [4] and [5], identifying Raleigh, Walsingham and Poley as the agents who bring about, with differing degrees of responsibility, Marlowe's death, the kitticat that swims and swims in the water.

14.3.2.1. *Raleigh's Connection with Marlowe's Death*

The full significance of the homophony between onomastic *Kit* and onomatopoeic *kit* in [83] cannot be appreciated unless the extract is seen in the co-text it is taken from:

> He read all through, his poem entire, the other, called a reply, entire, then quatrain answered by quatrain. Then the names —his and that of the great bejewelled courtier whom the Queen called Water and he himself, in grandiose magnification, Ocean. Kit, the very sound of dripping, kit kit kit, faced the roar and swell.

As with his entry into government service, effectuated through "a common concern in poetic trafficking" with Thomas Watson, it is poetry that draws Marlowe and Raleigh together. The poems referred to in the fragment are the former's pastoral lyric "Come Live With Me And Be My Love" and the latter's cynical stanza-by-stanza reply, the

first contact between the future playwright and the brilliant courtier. The amplification of the excerpt reveals a pun enclosing an augury of Marlowe's friendship with Raleigh while emphasising the social distance that separates them. The elevation of *Water*, an internally formed nickname resulting from the simplification of the /-lt-/ cluster, to *Ocean* and the diminution of *Kit* to *kit*, the verbalisation of the sound of water drops brought about by its assonance with *drip*, throws into relief the contrast between the magnificence of the Queen's favourite and the insignificance of the obscure student of divinity he eventually befriends. Their being compared to bodies of water vastly different in size represents Marlowe socially as a drop in the ocean with respect to Raleigh.

The word-play involved in the creation of the nickname also portends Marlowe's demise. To begin with, water, the vehicle of the pun, is the element Walsingham's drowning kitten struggles against, an image symbolising Marlowe's circumstances consequent on maintaining his relationship with Raleigh after rejoining the Service. The mispronunciation of *Walter* as *Water* is also central to the resolution of *2 Henry VI*. In Shakespeare's chronicle play Suffolk is told that "[b]y water shall he die and take his end" (I iv 34), a prophecy fulfilled by the earl being beheaded in an open boat on the sea by one Walter Whitmore. The French variant of the executioner's name, *Gaultier*, is homophonous with *water* (V i 34-7), as is mispronounced *Walter*. The drop-in-the-ocean image conjured up by Raleigh's exploitation of his mispronounced name to style himself *Ocean* alludes to Faustus' wish that his soul

> be changed into little water drops
> And fall into the ocean, ne'er to be found
> (V iii 195-6),

the triple repetition of onomatopoeic *kit* imitating the "little water drops." Although the inauspicious readings these allusions gives to the play on *Ocean* and *kit* are made explicit by the Narrator's description of Marlowe and Raleigh's first meeting as "the prologue to Kit's (…) tragedy," the tragic outcome of their relationship is already envisaged before they have even met each other. Water is an element frequently mentioned in *Edward II*, particularly in connection with suffering and punishment (Hopkins 2000: 125-26). During his confinement at Berkley Castle the King is shut up in "a vault up to the knees in water,/To which the channels of the castle run" after suffering the indignity of being washed and shaved in puddle water (V iii 27-36). Water, then, emerges as a motif whose association with suffering links *Edward II* to *Doctor*

Faustus, making the homophony of *water* with *Water* an aid to the identification of Marlowe with the heroes of these two tragedies.

The Shakespearean allusion triggered by *Water* fosters suspicions as to Raleigh's part in the killing of Marlowe. The head of *by water* in the augury is ambiguous because the preposition has both a locative and agentive meaning, both of which turn out to be relevant when the prophecy is finally fulfilled: Suffolk dies at Wa[l]ter's hands at a place near water. Similarly, Marlowe is murdered at Deptford Strand, on the banks of the Thames: hence "by water;" the murder might be committed with Raleigh's blessing: hence "by Water" as well. In the case of Marlowe, however, the ambiguity resides in the uncertainty of Raleigh's attitude towards the killing of his one-time protégé. As indicated in 14.2.2.1, Skeres refers to the interest Raleigh might have in having Marlowe silenced just before proceeding to do so, and the courtier's self-identification with Tamburlaine, substantiated by his participation in the Smerwick massacre, suggests that he is sufficiently hard-headed to sacrifice Marlowe for the sake of his self-preservation. On the other hand the Mephistophelean part Skeres plays, underwritten by his swarthiness and the satanic associations carried by *Nick*, detracts from the truth value of what he imparts to Marlowe before inviting Frizer to kill him. Mendacity and equivocation go with the demonic role Skeres assumes, and his insinuations may accordingly be put down to a spiteful desire to cause further mischief by having Marlowe believe that his patron wants him dead as well. Even if Skeres is lying or prevaricating, the fact remains that the killing is carried out under Raleigh's shadow, a situation foreshadowed by the literary allusions evoked by the interplay between his self-aggrandising nickname *Ocean* and the homophony of *Kit* with the onomatopoeic terms for dripping water.

14.3.2.2. *Thomas Walsingham's Implication*

By virtue of the homophonous relation between them, the disquieting connotations acquired by onomatopoeic *kit* in [83] on account of the allusions to *2 Henry VI* and *Doctor Faustus* are attached to its onomastic co-homophone in [26]-[27] via semantic contagion. In addition to its phonological bond, vocative *Kit* owes its acquired fatefulness to the characters represented as uttering them, Walsingham in the case of [26], and Poley in [27]. Of the two, Poley is directly involved in Marlowe's death: he arranges the Deptford meeting, orders the killing after failing to get Marlowe to betray Raleigh, and actively takes part in the murder by restraining the victim while he is

dispatched. Although not present at the killing, there are grounds for believing that Walsingham is an accomplice before the fact: the Deptford meeting is arranged at Scadbury, and the murder is committed by his steward Frizer. As seen in 9.3.3, the correspondences between Walsingham's naming style and Poley's are indicative of a deeper implication of the former in the Deptford affray. This is reinforced by the numerical parity between the free repetition of vocative *Kit* and the free repetition of onomatopoeic *kit*, which invests Walsingham's calls with the baleful overtones of Faustus' damnation soliloquy. Walsingham's shadow, like Raleigh's, lies heavy at Eleanor Bull's.

Walsingham and Raleigh, as suggested in 14.3.1.3, represent the opposing sides of the Faustian *psychomachia* Marlowe endures as a result of his divided loyalty to Seething Lane and Durham House, a debate hinted at in Raleigh's debunking of Marlowe's pastoral lyric. The inspiration for "Come with me and be my love," also known as "The passionate shepherd to his love," is Marlowe's passion for Walsingham insomuch as it can be identified with the "poem of love" he intends to compose after his return from Rheims [p.66]. On his way there he has a vision of "[c]lean Mr Thomas Walsingham (...) on knoll, piping" [p.41], a bucolic image expanded on, and sexed up, in the Arcadian setting to the passage beginning

> [i]t was in a field on the hot sabbath under an elm whose leaves were a tumult in the wind that promised a change of weather that Kit and Tom consummated, in all gentleness, the love that could be spoken aloud not in the disguise of French or Latin [p.62].

The elm placing their love-making within the frame of Virgil's second eclogue, the homoerotic elegy on the shepherd Corydon's unrequited love for the youth Alexis, as the composition ends with the rejected suitor coming to terms with the rebuff received from his hard-hearted beloved. "The passionate shepherd," as Smith (1990: 92) suggests, is modelled on the recital of the country pleasures with which Corydon tries to win Alexis' love, and in the context of the novel it may be read as Marlowe's attempt to woo Walsingham. On this account Raleigh's anti-pastoral, "The nymph's reply to the shepherd," expresses not such much a rejection of suit made in Marlowe's poem as a call to stop playing Corydon to Walsingham's Alexis. Not only is Walsingham unworthy of the suit, underscored by the Narrator's jaded reference to his "great idleness" and "pouting for praise though nought to be praised" [p.142]: he will also spurn Marlowe no sooner than he has no more use for him. The elm of their *locus*

amoenus becomes a portent of Walsingham's eventual betrayal of Marlowe in that Virgil mentions this tree when he exhorts his forlorn poetic persona to forget his fickle beloved[57]. What Raleigh is telling Marlowe is to place no trust in the incitement to court Walsingham in "come, Kit, Kit, Kit" [p.32] or to bed him in "[o]h Kit Kit Kit, you know where" [p.49].

The nymph of the title given to Raleigh's reply anticipates the antidote to the desire Walsingham arouses in Marlowe. *Nymph* is the term the Raleigh circle use to refer to tobacco, a personification that borrows from the pastoral convention to liken the relationship of the smoker with tobacco to that of a put-upon lover with a capricious and demanding beloved. The term also genders tobacco feminine so that the comparison is made in heterosexual terms, which in turn eroticises the rival claims Walsingham and Raleigh make on Marlowe by presenting the contest as a contention between homosexual and heterosexual desire. Raleigh's phrase for the need to satisfy the craving for a smoke, "[t]he nymph beckons" [p.125], personifies tobacco further by endowing it with the capacity to draw the smoker to it as the beloved draws her lover. The beckoning of the nymph tobacco therefore entices Marlowe away from the promise of the delights of male-male love held in Walsingham's siren call of "Kit, Kit, Kit." In this respect *tobacco sodomite* not only collapses smoking into paederastry, the nickname also highlights the division within Marlowe produced by his admiration for Raleigh and desire for Walsingham insofar as each element of the name identifies the pleasure they each blandish to draw him to them.

14.3.3. The Framing Function of the Conjuration Scene

Kit's tragedy diverges from its Faustian frame of reference in one important respect, namely the blurring of the clear-cut distinction between good and evil drawn in the play. Both of the causes which contend for Marlowe's soul seek to bind him to them by creating a heavy dependence in him to forestall any attempt on his part to break free from them: the delights male-male love hold for him on the one hand, and the pleasure derived from smoking on the other. Since sodomy and tobacco are deemed as unnatural, the contention for Marlowe's allegiance is one fought between rival sets of evil angels rather than between good and evil angels. Homoeroticism is a theme explored in *Edward II*, although the references to this play made in the narrative foreshadow

[57] Ah! Corydon, Corydon, what hath crazed your wit?/Your vine half-pruned hangs on the leafy elm;/Why haste you not to weave what need requires/Of pliant rush or osier? Scorned by this/Elsewhere some new Aleixis you will find (Eclogue II, 85-9)

Marlowe's death instead of reflecting his homosexuality. In *Doctor Faustus* sex and sexuality is touched on in the scene in which Mephistophilis is asked to conjure up Helen of Troy so that she may become Faustus' mistress (V ii 88-116). Although the subsequent union is a heterosexual one, it mirrors the homosexual liaison between Marlowe and Thomas Walsingham in that it encouraged by the Service as a means of ensuring the former's loyalty, as the compliance to Faustus' wish "may extinguish clear/ Those thoughts that do dissuade me from my vow (...) I made to Lucifer" (*Doctor Faustus* V ii 92-93). Like the damnation soliloquy, the conjuration scene is referred or alluded to on three occasions in the narrative: in a dress rehearsal held before the première of the play, in a garbled quotation of Faustus' rhapsody on Helen's beauty, and in a dream Marlowe has shortly before he is done to death. Like the damnation soliloquy, too, the conjuration scene portends Marlowe's tragic end, though linking it with his homosexuality.

The first mention of Helen of Troy is made in the reference to the Narrator's unsuitability for the walk-on part of *Doctor Faustus*: "I would not play Helen of Troy, I was beyond it, and Ned Alleyn gave me though grudgingly the part of the servant Wagner, who is a sort of Faustus in a lesser figure" [p.155]. Despite the directness of the parenthetical clause *I was beyond it*, there is some ambiguity as to whether it is the Narrator or the company that feels that he is not up to personating female characters, due to the two readings that can be given to the verb phrase in *I would not play Helen of Troy*. On the one hand *would* may be interpreted as conveying pure futurity, giving to understand that the Narrator has not been given the role on account of a decision made by the company. On the other hand, the modal verb may express volition, in which case the Narrator has not been given the role because he refuses to take it. The concessive clause in "Ned Alleyn gave me though grudgingly the part of the servant Wagner" favours the second reading: the Narrator wants to exchange a female for a male role against Alleyn's judgement. The reason given for his refusal is that he is growing older, and so will no longer be able to convince the audience that he is a woman. In addition to age, however, there is a deeper reason for the Narrator's unwillingness to assume the role of Helen. Faustus' kissing his paramour, cued in by "Sweet Helen, make me immortal with a kiss" (V i 99), has traditionally been interpreted as the point of no return in his downward slide to damnation (Marcus 1996: 52). By drawing attention to his refusal to take the part, then, the Narrator distances himself from those who bring about the downfall of Marlowe, who is identified with Faustus.

The interpretation of the kissing episode as the precise instant in which Faustus seals his doom brings sex into play. In early Modern English *kiss* is a metaleptic euphemism for sexual intercourse (Partridge 1968 [1947]: 130; Williams 1994: 761-2 II) insofar as kissing is part of the foreplay to penetrative sex. Accordingly, a "dirty-minded" reading of Faustus' line renders it as an invitation to Helen to have sex with him, a reading reinforced by recasting "make me immortal" as "make me die," *die* meaning 'have an orgasm' (Partridge 1968 [1947]: 93). This would make Faustus guilty of necrophilia as well as necromancy to the extent that having sex with a woman raised from the dead is to have sex with a dead woman, although according to some interpretations of the scene (Greg 1946: 106) the sin he commits is that of demoniality, sexual union with a demon, because the spirit conjured up is not Helen, but a succubus, a demon in female form. The identification of Marlowe with Faustus, however, brings about a change of the sexual parameters to the perdition theme. Faustus' damnation is, quite literally, consummated through a simulacrum of a heterosexual union, whereas Marlowe's downfall is part precipitated by male-male desire.

The shift from heterosexual to male homosexual desire is hinted at in the incomplete citation of Faustus' line in the following discussion of the desirability of having a woman play the part of Helen:

> —We will have a woman, Kit said. There be some of Henslowe's girl goslings that will for a shilling parade naked.
> —We cannot, we cannot, Ned headshook, there has never yet been a woman on the stage. And to have a woman naked would close us down.
> —Draped, not wholly bare of the arse and bubs. Walking across the tarass first with no words. Then, with no words, below.
> —And then I kiss her. Sweet Helen, make me immortal with a.
> —You would prefer to kiss a woman than a boy, unlike some.
> —Joan would not like it, even in a play.
> —A boy then, well-draped [p.155].

The comment elicited by Alleyn's failure to cite the line complete is a dig at once at the hypocrisy of his scruples about kissing a woman and Marlowe's homosexuality. By presenting the spectacle of a man kissing a half naked boy, the prejudice against bringing women onstage invests the kissing episode with paederastic overtones, as the rehearsing actors are only too well aware. In its bawdy sense *kiss* undergoes a change of meaning with a change of direct object, from 'have sex with' when the verb governs *a woman* to 'have anal sex' when it governs *a boy*. Alleyn's hesitation in pronouncing *kiss* makes the word conspicuous by its very absence, highlighting the taboo on male homosexuality conveyed by the verb as a result of the paederastic connotations it

acquires from the transvestite tradition of the Elizabethan stage. The inadvertently paederastic undertones of the enactment of the kissing episode tailor the pernicious effect of sexual desire on individual salvation to Marlowe's case. His perdition is in part caused by male-male desire, anticipated by Father Ballard's resignedly Faustian reply of "you must needs be damned" to Marlowe's obduracy to the priest's request that he should renounce sodomy (see 6.3.1).

As the principal object of Marlowe's desire, Walsingham is cast in the role of Helen, which makes him a prime agent in his lover's downfall. In *Doctor Faustus* Helen appears twice: she is first paraded before the Scholars who have asked Faustus to conjure her up so that they can admire her beauty, and then is brought back at Faustus' request so that he can possess her. These two apparitions find their equivalent in *A Dead Man in Deptford* is Marlowe's first encounter with Walsingham, at Seething Lane, and their first sexual encounter, in Rheims. The "fever that had to be allayed" that grips Marlowe on setting eyes on Walsingham at the first encounter is resonant of Faustus' more articulate and lyrical expression of his desire for Helen:

> One thing, good servant, let me crave of
> thee,
> To glut the longing of my heart's desire,
> That I may have unto my paramour
> That heavenly Helen which I saw of late
> (*Doctor Faustus* V i 88-91).

The "good servant" addressed is Mephistophilis, who in Helen's first apparition is indicated in the stage directions as bringing her before the Scholars, suggesting that it is not Faustus, but his familiar spirit that calls Helen back from the dead. Walsingham's appearance at Seething Lane may likewise be stage managed with the express view to making Marlowe fall in love with him, a reading discussed in 7.3.4. On meeting again at Rheims, Walsingham frankly admits that he has been sent after Marlowe to keep an eye on him and promptly proposes to have sex, a promptness that fosters the suspicion that the proposition is also covered by Walsingham's brief. Mephistophilis accedes to Faustus' request to conjure Helen up a second time because it will prevent the latter from trying to make his peace with God, a possibility that he has already begun to consider. In like manner Marlowe's employers see his desire for Walsingham as a means of ensuring his loyalty. The consummation of that desire seals Marlowe's doom as much as the kiss Faustus gives to Helen seals his.

As a coda to each apparition there is a speech by the Old Man, the first urging Faustus to repentance, and the second deploring his inevitable damnation. In the tragedy of Marlowe-Faust the role of the Old Man falls to Frizer in the ill-natured encounter at the Three Tuns, a kind of dress rehearsal for the Deptford affray (see 12.1.1). Shortly after meeting, and ostensibly to show his appreciation of Marlowe's poetical skill, Frizer recites four lines of Faustus' address to Helen, though getting them wrong, namely

> *Was this the face that launched a hundred ships*
> *And burned the topless towers of Iliad* [p.189]

for

> Was this the face that launched a thousand
> ships,
> And burnt the topless towers of Ilium?
> (V i 97-8)

and

> *I'll be Paris and for love of thee*
> *Instead of Troy shall Winchester be sacked* [p.190]

for

> I will be Paris, and for love of thee
> Instead of Troy shall Wittenberg be sacked
> (V i 104-5).

It is during the speech Frizer misquotes that the Old Man enters, and at its conclusion he delivers his second speech lamenting Faustus' passing up the last chance of securing his salvation. The prohibition of Marlowe's homosexual affair with Walsingham that the garbled recital from *Doctor Faustus*, however, has the admonitory tone of the Old Man's first speech exhorting Faustus to repent while there is time. The injunction "[t]here is to be no more beastliness" [p.191], tempered by the encouragement to "cleanly love," contains a faint echo of the Old Man's description of magic "most vilde and loathsome filthiness[58]." *Beastliness*, Frizer's synonym for *sodomy*, is set in opposition to *cleanness*, his synonym for *morality* (see the discussion on *clean Robin* 12.1.3.3), which is also antonymous with *filthiness*. Both Frizer and the Old Man, then, urge what the former terms "[c]leanness of life" [p.190], though the terms each use to refer to its opposite suggest different types of morality. Whereas *filthiness* refers to

[58] From the A version of the Old Man's first speech used in the Tucker Brooke edition of *Doctor Faustus* (1279) and quoted in Steane (ed.) (1969: 594).

Faustus' flouting of the injunction to fear God, *beastliness* alludes to Marlowe's disregard of sexual mores.

Frizer's focus on sexual morality is announced through the substitution of *Winchester* for *Wittenberg*[59]. To begin with, the clarification "I said Winchester (...) because I was thinking on Winchester geese" [p.190] gives to understand that the slip is not as innocent as it seems. In the sexual argot of the Elizabethan age *Winchester geese* is the name given to the prostitutes working in the brothels established in the liberties of the bishop of Winchester, situated on the south bank of the Thames, outside the jurisdiction of the city of London (Partridge 1968 [1947]: 219; Burgess 1970: 172; Williams 1994: 1538). Besides brothels, the liberties contained the public playhouses, including the Rose, encouraging the association of popular drama with immorality. Players and playwrights are consequently regarded as morally on a par with prostitutes and pimps so that they qualify as Winchester geese as well. The general thrust of Frizer's innuendo, then, is that he sees Marlowe as no better than a prostitute on the make. The warning against "beastliness" is meant to disabuse Marlowe of the idea that his appointment as "the poet that resideth" at Scadbury will allow him to continue his affair with Walsingham behind the respectable front of the patron-client relationship that now exists between them.

Frizer's admonition has a similar effect on Marlowe as the Old Man's first speech does on Faustus. Just as the scholar-sorcerer experiences pangs of conscience, so the poet-playwright's relationship with his patron becomes one of celibacy after taking up residence at Scadbury. Again, the salutary effect of the warnings soon wears off. Faustus is first bullied and then bribed into honouring his contract with Lucifer, Mephistophilis' threat to "in piecemeal tear thy flesh" (V i 73) offset by his compliance with Faustus' request to have Helen as his paramour. Marlowe is forced to resume government service in return for the assistance given by his employers to get him out of Newgate, the bitterness of his return sugared by the resumption of his interrupted romance with Walsingham. Marlowe's disregard of Frizer's ban on the "beastliness" of male-male love likewise parallels Faustus' inattention to the Old Man's call to leave off from the "filthiness" of necromancy. Yet whereas the Old Man abandons the stage to the devils that come on to carry Faustus off to hell, Frizer remains to claim Marlowe's life, assuming the role of Lightborn-Lucifer[60].

---

[59] *Wertenberg* in the Tucker Brooke edition of *Doctor Faustus* (1336), based on the A version of the play.
[60] See the discussion on the identification of Frizer with Lightborn in 14.2.2.2, and on his identification

Frizer is not the only character to exchange roles at the Deptford meeting. His mangling of the lines from Faustus' address to Helen foreshadows the dream he has in which she appears before him:

> Then Helen approached him from the battlements. She should not do this, she should know his nature, she should not be naked, bore his eyes with her breasts, oppose to his flaccid rod the mouth of the cave whose interior was the labyrinth where the rending Minotaur bellowed. No, no, he would not [pp.262-3].

Here the Trojan princess does not come across as the succubus that helps to bring about Faustus' downfall she is interpreted to be, but a good angel making a last-ditch attempt to redeem Marlowe. The sin she tries to save him from is his homosexuality, identifying his failure to respond to her, the paragon of feminine beauty, as one of the triggers that precipitate the tragedy awaiting him after he wakes up. The Helen of Marlowe's dream, in other words, has assumed the role played by the Old Man in *Doctor Faustus*, that of good counsel ignored. Her inability to arouse him is in part due to "his nature," Marlowe's sexual orientation, though mainly to the fact that he has already been led astray by his own Helen of Troy, Thomas Walsingham.

4.4. Recapitulation

The present chapter takes as its point of departure the premise that the double address of *Mr Tom Berlaine* and *Doctor Forster* represents the characters Tamburlaine and Faustus as dramatic projections of their creator, particularly as regards his perceived views on religion. The picture painted of Marlowe is a composite one based on a simplistic reading of a single incident from each play, the Koran-burning episode in *2 Tamburlaine*, and the devil-raising episode in *Doctor Faustus*. The atheistical construction put on the challenge to Mohammed excises the providentialist interpretation of the episode suggested by Tamburlaine's sudden and unaccounted for sickness at the end of the scene. Faustus' atheism, implied in "I think hell's a fable" (*Doctor Faustus* I v 130), is refuted by the presupposition his entire tragedy hinges on, namely the existence of a merciful but just God that punishes the errant scholar as much for his despair of attaining salvation as his pact with the Devil. Yet the insistence on Faustus' apostasy disregards the orthodox moral drawn from the play by the Chorus. The Marlowe that is constructed through the reductionist readings of his two plays, the ranting atheist endowed with supernatural powers, is the result of the resolution of their

---

with Lucifer in 14.3.1.2.

ambivalence with regard to the religious issues they touch on in favour of the view that both *Doctor Faustus* and *Tamburlaine* express their author's hostility to established beliefs. To hedge one's bets in matters of religious orthodoxy is interpretable as a dissimulated animosity towards religion, and is therefore deserving of the label *atheism* as openly declaring disbelief or leading a shamelessly wicked life. Despite the jocular tone in which they are used, *Tom Berlaine* and *Doctor Forster* label their recipient as a profligate that engages in godless talk and student of forbidden arts.

The Narrator adopts the view that the affinity of Tamburlaine and Faustus with Marlowe lies in the parallels that can be drawn between the career pursued by the playwright and that of the characters he creates. Tamburlaine goes from victory to victory, bringing entire empires under his sway by the sword and his eloquence, until he sickens and dies. He is the scourge of God, the bloodthirsty tyrant and unconscious agent of divine justice visited on sinful nations (Whitfield White 2004: 71) that, according to the providentialist reading of the Koran-burning episode, is finally struck down by the god he serves and whose place he aspires to usurp. Marlowe goes from tavern brawl to tavern brawl, outraging all those who hear him with his blasphemous talk and profane curses, until he receives his comeuppance in another tavern brawl. He self-consciously assumes the role of the scourge of God, drawing on Machiavelli to expose and lambaste the thirst for power the ruling elite dissemble behind a façade of piety, an attack that brings down on him the charge of atheism and gives grounds for the interpretation of his death as divine punishment for a life given up to slandering religion and indulging his unnatural appetites. After selling his soul to Lucifer, Faustus spends the twenty-four years allotted to him either on using the magical powers granted him in empty conjuring tricks or on debating with himself on the wisdom of the step he has taken, hesitating between trusting himself to God's mercy and resigning himself to his damnation until Lucifer finally comes for him. Marlowe's life is likewise divided into laying on entertainment to the theatre-going public and gathering information for the government, the underhanded methods employed in the latter activity causing him to question the morality of his decision to join the Service, exacerbated by his co-option into the Raleigh circle. His identification with Durham House and commitment to Seething Lane take on the character of the *psychomachia* in which Walter Raleigh and Thomas Walsingham have the role of the rival angels, the one appealing to Marlowe's restless mind, and the other to his easily aroused sexual desire. However, while Faustus is lost because he lacks the moral courage to break the bargain he has struck with the

Devil, Marlowe's ruin comes about because he tries to go back on the agreement he has entered into with the Service. For the Narrator, then, *Tamburlaine* and *Faustus* are alternative names for Marlowe in that the lives of the characters bearing them resemble their creator's so closely, not least in the propensity of the plays in which they appear to be misrepresented.

Tamburlaine is Marlowe's public persona, the opinionated tavern orator that airs his cynical views on the disparity between religious ideals and practices, and is labelled an atheist in return. Faustus is his private persona, the scholar trained in divinity that takes religion more seriously than the detractors that denounce his atheism. Although arriving at conclusions that are inconsistent with orthodox teaching, Faustus-Marlowe's engagement with the religious culture he is part of reveals a profound concern for the existence of divine principle that might be described as devotional. His experience in the Elizabethan secret service provides him with an object lesson in the use of religious cant in power politics that confirms him in the cynical view of institutional religion as a means of holding on to power and subduing dissent. As far as his cynicism affects the belief in a benevolent personal god, the stance Marlowe adopts is the Epicurean one that the existence of evil is incompatible with the existence of an omniscient and omnipotent god that cares about the welfare of humankind. If God exists, he is either impotent because he wants to abolish evil but cannot, or wicked because he can abolish evil but will not (see 10.3.3). If Marlowe is an atheist, as his enemies affirm, then he is very much a God-haunted one (Hunter, quoted in Whitfield White 2004: 86), although that by itself provides sufficient grounds for condemning him.

15. The Question of the Narrator’s Identity

Among other things the review of the framing function of *Tamburlaine* and *Doctor Faustus* conducted in the previous chapter confirms Jacques' pronouncement that, in the Great Theatre of the World, "one man in his time plays many parts." The Koran-burning episode in the one play, and the debate between the forces of good and evil over Faustus' soul enacted in the other are mirror images respectively of Marlowe's outspoken scepticism and the competing claims placed on him by Seething Lane and Durham House, casting him into the roles of Tamburlaine and Faustus. On the other hand, the intertextual frames which permeate and inform the narrative demonstrates the converse to Jacques' statement, namely that many men play one part. Besides Marlowe, Walter Raleigh and Ingram Frizer are identified with the role of Tamburlaine, perhaps with better cause than its creator. Similarly, as indicated in 13.1.3, Gaveston and Edward are roles which Marlowe shares with Thomas Walsingham until the latter steps out of them to assume the role of Mortimer by setting Frizer-Lightborn on to his discarded lover. That Walsingham escapes the fates of Gaveston, Edward and Mortimer carries further implications for the relation between the narrative and the antecedent texts which frame it. In reflecting the vicissitudes Marlowe undergoes, the literary works woven into the relation of Kit's tragedy are modified by them. Walsingham's Edward indulges in the pleasures derived from homosexual love without forfeiting his position and the privileges which go with it, his Gaveston manipulates his lover without creating powerful enemies who conspire to overthrow him, and his Mortimer plans the destruction of the man who stands in the way of the realisation of his ambitions without retribution falling on him. Consequently, if the works making up the intertextual frame constitutes the tragic glass through which Marlowe's fortunes are to be viewed, then the narration of Marlowe's fortunes itself may be likened to a kaleidoscope in which its actors are constantly changing form through a continuous exchange and re-scripting of the roles they interpret.

The consideration of acting different parts as a species of metamorphosis draws attention to the Narrator, who maintains a constant if shadowy presence throughout the narrative. More specifically, it draws attention to his identity, concealed behind the various dramatic personae he appears as in the references he makes to his acting career. Because of variety of roles he plays, the Narrator emerges as a protean and elusive figure that changes sex as well as identity as he progresses from a boy actor playing female roles to an adolescent playing male ones. His elusiveness is most patent in the reticence he shows in revealing his identity, with the result that the reader is as curious

to discover who he is as who Marlowe is. While in the dramatist's case the interest is in the character hidden behind the personae suggested by the continual flux of constantly metamorphosing variants of *Marlowe*, in the Narrator's case it is finding out the real name among the character names he mentions with the aid of the clue offered in the epilogue. As with the application of *Tamburlaine* and *Faustus* to Marlowe, the naming of the Narrator sets up an intertextual frame through which to interpret his relation to the events he recounts, in particular his relationship with Marlowe.

More than Walsingham, then, the Narrator embodies metamorphosis, the paradox of changing yet remaining the same, expressed by Jacques' image of the actor who plays many parts. Metamorphosis, however, presupposes the existence of a fixed, unchangeable essence of the entity undergoing the transformation, a presupposition suggested by the Narrator's reference to his "true identity" under "the guise of Balthasar" in his appearance in *Much Ado About Nothing*. The notion of a fixed, stable self is undermined by the Narrator's secretiveness regarding his real identity, creating the impression of an absence of such a self behind the change of character names accompanying the dramatic roles he is given. Like Alleyn, the Narrator is an "empty vessel to be filled with what the poet brewed," only more so because the reader does not know his name. Although the transformation from female into male the Narrator vicariously undergoes in the course of his career enacts the construction of a male identity from an indeterminate one, the absence of a name which, in McWhir's words (1995: 105), would help to fix and prescribe the identity thus constructed prevents it from acquiring a semblance of substantiality. By withholding his name from the reader, therefore, the Narrator presses the point that personal identity is merely a construct built on the continual metamorphoses the self goes through during interaction with others. Behind the personae put on for different occasions there is no permanent, unchanging identity, only a name for the performing self who puts on the personae.

15.1. The Framing Function of the Roles Played by the Narrator

Besides evasiveness, the main impression the Narrator leaves is one of reticence. Not only does he avoid committing himself to the veracity of what he relates, he is also particularly close-mouthed about his own identity. The image the reader forms of him has to be pieced together from the scanty autobiographical details scattered throughout the narrative, consisting largely of references to the stage plays he appeared in as an

actor and collaborated in as a playwright. These references also mean that the Narrator is not entirely nameless thanks to the roles he mentions he has played:

> I saw Kit for the first time in London for the first time in London at Burbage's theatre, named aptly the Theatre, when I played Bel-Imperia in *The Spanish Tragedy* [p.14]
>
> But with *Tamburlaine*, in which I played the divine Zenocrate, there were voices that spoke to a world greater than the playhouse [p.119]
>
> I would not play Helen of Troy, I was beyond it, and Ned Alleyn gave me though grudgingly the part of the servant Wagner, who is a sort of Faustus in a lesser figure [p.155]
>
> At the Rose that autumn there was rehearsal for a revival of *Tamburlaine*, and I was no longer the divine Zenocrate but the cringing younger son of the tyrant [p.165]
>
> it was a mingling of all the companies that gathered (…) to enact Kit's *Rich Jew of Malta* (…) [in which] I (…) took the part of Pilia-Borza [p.226].

Perpetual anonymity, as Pulgram (1954: 3) points out, cannot be believable, and such implausibility is avoided through the compromise whereby the various roles the Narrator assumes allow him to be named without disclosing his real identity. Accordingly, and paraphrasing his reference to the bit-part he plays in *Much Ado About Nothing*, the Narrator enters his memoir under the guise of Bel-Imperia, Zenocrate, Wagner, Calyphas and Pilia-Borza, as well as Balthasar. The roll call of characters given also provides the reader with a record of the Narrator's undistinguished career in the London playhouse during the great flowering of Elizabethan drama, especially when he starts "conning the parts of young men," a turning-point described as a "sharp declension from the glory of Bel-Imperia and Zenocrate" [p.142]. The roles he takes on also provide a record of his association with Marlowe in that the relation of the characters he personates with the lead roles of the plays reflects the nature of their relationship at the time the plays are staged. The correspondences between the Narrator's career on the boards and his acquaintance with Marlowe points to an overlap between fiction and reality analogous to that occasioned by the play-with-a-play device condensed in the admission of "small actor and smaller play-botcher" [p.3]. Besides providing him with an identity of sorts, then, the character names he purportedly assumes assists the Narrator in his self-appointed task of chorus by providing him with various positions from which to speak from. More importantly, they offer him the opportunity to speak about himself in relation to such a controversial figure as Marlowe without giving too much away about himself. Thanks to the onomastic subterfuge he

resorts to, the Narrator is able to appear in his own relation *incognito* if not anonymously.

15.1.1. The Framing Function of the Female Roles

The switch from female to male roles marks the Narrator's passage from boyhood to adolescence, onomastically signalled by the transition from *Zenocrate* to *Wagner*. As he grows up, moreover, he grows out of his paederastic liaison with Marlowe. By the time he is "shaving once a week," the Narrator reports, he has "come to hate the prying paws of the small gallants who came to the tiring room," a disgust which causes him to "thrust Kit away" whenever he comes "to woo me into undressing with I love thee I love thee" [p.142]. Professionally, however, the end of his boyhood and affair with Marlowe constitutes a kind of climacteric in that both these events also mark the moment in which the Narrator's career as an actor goes into irreversible decline. The names *Bel-Imperia* and *Zenocrate* consequently identify the high point of his professional life to the extent that they both identify the lead female roles of *The Spanish Tragedy* and *Tamburlaine*, in contrast to the bit-parts that go under the names of *Wagner*, *Calyphas* and *Pilia-Borza*. The two female character names also seem to define the Narrator's romance with Marlowe as the acme of his sex life insomuch as the absence of references to subsequent loving or sexual relationships would suggest, if not celibacy, a falling-off in intensity after breaking off his affair with his playwright-lover. However, *Bel-Imperia* differs from *Zenocrate* in that the role it names brings a double perspective to bear on their relationship: an internal perspective provided by the Narrator's role as the object of Marlowe's desire, and an external one attendant on the retrospective view afforded by the Narrator's role as a reminiscing subject. As Bel-Imperia, the Narrator is actor in, and at the same time author of, what he terms Kit's tragedy: he is chronicler of Marlowe's life, a chronicle in which he occasionally appears as the dramatist's sexual partner. The perspective provided by *Zenocrate* is purely internal: the name simply frames the highlight of his affair with Marlowe within the relationship between Tamburlaine and his consort.

15.1.1.1. *The Double Perspective Given by* Bel-Imperia

The double perspective provided by *Bel-Imperia* is traceable to the two dead lovers the character of this name has in *The Spanish Tragedy*. One of them, Andrea, is already dead before the action of the play begins, killed in battle, and the other, Horatio, is

murdered during the play on the orders of a jealous rival for Bel-Imperia's favours. The deaths of Andrea and Horatio are collapsed into Marlowe's in *A Dead Man in Deptford*, as a result of the frame-and-inset structure of the narrative: the chronicle which culminates in the murder of the dramatist is purportedly written over thirty years after his death. Of Bel-Imperia's two relationships one is assigned to the Narrator as chronicler of Marlowe's life, consequently casting Marlowe into the role of Andreas, and the other to the Narrator as actor in it, casting Marlowe into the role of Horatio. The heroine of the revenge tragedy wishes to avenge the death of Andrea, and, looking for an ally to help her carry out her design, becomes emotionally involved with Horatio. The Narrator is driven by a similar desire for restitution. Believing that his former lover, Marlowe, was murdered, and that the account given of his death is a deliberate misrepresentation designed to cover up the killing and malign the victim, the Narrator sets out in his memoir to expose and denounce those who had a hand, directly or indirectly, in Marlowe's death. The role of avenging angel falls to the Narrator-chronicler, which positions him outside the story he relates, and that of beloved to the Narrator-character, which places him within the story: hence the double perspective provided by the part of Bel-Imperia.

Insofar as *The Spanish Tragedy* is an intertextual frame for *A Dead Man in Deptford*, Marlowe is a composite of Andrea and Horatio while Bel-Imperia is split between the avenging Narrator as chronicler and the beloved Narrator as actor in the chronicle. In his former capacity the Narrator inhabits a sphere analogous to the underworld from which the ghost of Andrea and Revenge view the disintegration of the Spanish court. As a result the Narrator as avenging angel is identifiable with Revenge, although he is accompanied by the memory of Marlowe rather than his ghost. Unlike his allegorical counterpart, who is content with simply letting events run their course, the Narrator actively exacts vengeance by shaping the events he relates so as to show Marlowe's enemies in the worst light as possible. On the other hand, he does not have the satisfaction of seeing them receive their comeuppance as Andrea finally does, with the possible exception of Essex and Raleigh, who "in that order, go to the block on Tower Hill" [p.269]. "Most names in this brief chronicle," the Narrator ruefully comments in the epilogue, "faded from sight, so we may envisage their owners dying in peaceful beds perfumed in lavender." As an exposé, then, his memoir is ineffective because the individuals arraigned therein are dead, and therefore cannot be made accountable for their crime. In this respect the Narrator turns out to be a more ineffectual avenger than

Revenge, who comes across in *The Spanish Tragedy* as a force that animates the characters into taking the law into their own hands.

In line with the type-antitype pattern that recurs throughout the narrative the performance at the Theatre prefigures the role of avenger the Narrator assumes on writing his memoir. If he "saw Kit for the first time" when he "played Bel-Imperia in *The Spanish Tragedy*," then Marlowe saw him for the first time in his future role as the avenger of his death." The observation that Marlowe "was on a stage stool, next to Watson" [p.14] places him in the space the Narrator-chronicler occupies, on the edge of the events played out on stage. Given the identification of this vantage point with the nether world inhabited by Revenge and the ghost of Andrea, this momentarily casts Marlowe into the role of his future ghost looking at the spectacle of his past life as recounted by the older self of the boy-actor performing before him.

15.1.1.2. *The Framing Function of* Zenocrate

The twin roles of beloved and avenger anticipated by the Narrator's part in *The Spanish Tragedy* are inscribed in the name of his dramatic persona. Its first element —from Latin *bella*, meaning 'agreeable' or 'graceful'— characterises her as the sensual woman who attracts the attention of Andrea, Horatio and Balthazar, whereas the second —the feminised form of *imperium*, meaning 'control' or 'dominion'— defines her as strong-willed, the moral mainstay of her overriding desire for revenge (Mulryne 1989 [1970]: xxx). As argued in 15.1.1, Bel-Imperia's first role is assumed by the Narrator-actor, a role he also plays under the name of *Zenocrate*.

The role of Zenocrate marks the peak of the Narrator's career on the stage and his relationship with Marlowe, a coincidence discernible in

> I hear still Ned Alleyn's thunder or, to me as Zenocrate, the honey of wooing, and, from backstage, see his throat bared to the dust as to a dagger while he gulped what he termed his lubricant ale. Then back onstage to conquer Persia, Africa, Europe Asia, India, ride in triumph through Persepolis, slaughter the Turks, the Tartars, the Babylonians and even yearn towards enchaining the meteors, the moon, Saturn, the sun. And always this lust not easily slaked, except when he turned to me, his divine Zenocrate, transformed in a manner of courtier no court could have taught [pp.119-20].

The recollection of his first appearance in *1 Tamburlaine* becomes a recapitulation of the play in which the Narrator and the character he personates in it are fused together. On the two occasions he refers to himself he mentions the name of the character he plays, as the complement in a prepositional phrase occurring after *me* on its first token appearance, and on its second as the head of a non-restrictive appositional phrase acting

as a gloss on *me*. On reading the prepositional phrase in the light of the apposition, moreover, we notice that *as* is disambiguated by the co-referentiality of the appositional phrase with the personal pronoun it specifies. Since the Narrator is the referent of both *his divine Zenocrate* and *me*, the preposition expresses his identification with Zenocrate rather than resemblance to her. The transformation of the Narrator into the character he personates is marked by the incremental nature of the repetition of *Zenocrate*. On its second token appearance the name is not only qualified by the flattering epithet *divine* but also limited by the possessive determiner *his*, rendering the phrase a reported endearment. In identifying himself with an object of amorous advances, the Narrator sees himself as the recipient of "the honey of wooing."

The transformation from appearing as the beloved to being the beloved is traceable to the incantatory effect of Tamburlaine's lines. What the Narrator first remembers about the performance is hearing "Ned Alleyn's thunder" and "honey of wooing," which would identify the lead actor as the "courtier no court could have taught." This memory, however, is offset by the remembrance of seeing Alleyn taking draughts of beer between going off and coming back on stage, to soothe a throat made hoarse from constant declaiming. In highlighting the illusory nature of his dramatic persona, the candid view afforded of him backstage suggests that his identification with Tamburlaine is not as complete as the Narrator's identification with Zenocrate, ruling Alleyn out as the referent of the possessive determiner in *his divine Zenocrate*. Unlike the Narrator, who becomes Zenocrate by hearing Tamburlaine's lines, Alleyn does not become Tamburlaine by speaking them. Of course, in keeping with the description of him as "the empty vessel to be filled with what the poet brewed," the words Alleyn pronounces are not his, but Marlowe's. Accordingly, if the words penned by the playwright are what enrapture the Narrator, then the courtier that seduces him is Marlowe, making him the referent of *his*. Marlowe, the Narrator fancies, speaks to him under the guise of Tamburlaine through Alleyn.

The point of resemblance the Narrator finds between Tamburlaine and Marlowe is markedly different to the one established and popularised by Robert Greene. Whereas the latter's interpretation of the Koran-burning episode identifies Marlowe with Tamburlaine the ranting atheist, the former identifies him with Tamburlaine the beguiling but forceful lover. The transition from the one, captured in "Ned Alleyn's thunder," to the other, caught in "the honey of wooing," is in part signalled by *this lust*. In the context in which it occurs the phrase refers to Tamburlaine's insatiable appetite

for power, conveyed by his chagrin at not being able to extend his conquests beyond the world, although its head primarily connotes sexual desire. The collapsing of a desire for military into sexual conquest is effected in the first two sentences of the paragraph that follows the passage quoted above, and that makes explicit the identification of Marlowe with Tamburlaine:

> I say lust and lust again. It was all Kit lusting, a male body augmented to a world his prey and no retribution [p.120].

In 6.2.2 it was suggested that the inspiration for the copulatory image is the sexual assault with which the Narrator's love affair with Marlowe begins, described in

> And so he found me alone, conning the part of the Queen in *Hamlet-Revenge*, a half-finished play of Tom Kyd's (all these Toms, a world of toms like a night roof top). His eyes closed, muttering strange words and also groaning, he had me stripped and himself stripped and was soon at work that seemed strangely loveless [pp.35-6].

Tamburlaine's relationship with Zenocrate also begins with a rape, although in this case *rape* is to be understood in its literary sense of carrying off a woman to make her the abductor's bride rather than its more usual acceptation of having sex with someone against their will. The rape the Narrator is victim of enforces a re-appraisal of the appositional phrase in which he identifies himself with Zenocrate which dispels the impression of romantic idyll it creates, and which will be examined in 15.2.1 in the light of another intertextual frame.

15.1.2. The Framing Function of the Male Roles Played by the Narrator

The three male roles the Narrator mentions as having played mirror more his professional than his love life. What these parts have in common, in addition to the sex of the characters, is their relation to the lead roles of the respective plays they appear in, summed up in the description of Wagner as "a sort of Faustus in a lesser figure." To begin with, *lesser* brings to mind *smaller* in the Narrator's self-deprecatory description "I was but a small actor and smaller play-botcher." Not only do the adjectives have similar evaluative content and are realised in the comparative degree, the elements of comparison belong in both cases to the world of the playhouse: two characters of a play in the case of *lesser*, and two key professions related to the stage in the case of *smaller*. The link binding the two comparisons together is the Narrator himself, evidenced by the relation of co-referentiality of *I* with *small actor* and *smaller play-botcher* on the one hand, and on the other the disclosure that "Ned Alleyn gave me though grudgingly the part of Wagner." Given their polysemy, moreover, the two adjectives establish two

points of comparison. The first is importance, conveyed primarily through *lesser*. Wagner is a less important role than that of Faustus and therefore is played by an unknown actor like the Narrator, whereas the leading role is reserved for a celebrity like Alleyn. The second point of comparison is mediocrity. Faustus is drawn as a man of great learning and powerful intellect whose insatiable desire for knowledge leads him astray, qualities which lend a tragic dimension to his character. Wagner is a clown, and his apeing his master's experiments with the occult accentuates rather than diminishes the differences which separate them. Whereas Faustus' downfall arouses pity and horror, Wagner's discomfiture provokes laughter. The disparity between these two characters is mirrored in the Narrator's career as both playwright and actor: in the latter capacity he is eclipsed by Alleyn's formidable stage presence and in the latter by the equally formidable creative genius of Marlowe and Shakespeare. The marked inequality in eminence and worth is also reflected in the relation between Tamburlaine and Calyphas, referred to as "the cringing younger son of the tyrant," and Barabas and Pilia-borza. The diminishing importance of the roles he is given plot the inexorable decline of the Narrator's acting career and his failure to make a name for himself as a dramatist. Just as Wagner tries to emulate Faustus, the Narrator tries to follow first in Alleyn's and then Marlowe's footsteps, only to disappear into obscurity after his efforts fall through.

15.1.2.1. *The Framing Function of* Calyphas

Paraphrasing the description of Wagner in relation to Faustus, the Narrator is Ned Alleyn in a lesser figure as regards the art of acting. Of the three male roles named Calyphas is perhaps the one that best defines the Narrator's frustrated acting career, mainly on account of the stormy relationship of this character with Tamburlaine. As implied by the Narrator's unflattering description of him, Calyphas is the unwarlike son Tamburlaine repudiates and kills for refusing to go into battle, combining cowardice and rebelliousness under his shirking of filial duty. The antagonism between "the tyrant" and his "cringing younger son" is replicated in the estrangement of the Narrator from Alleyn offstage, although without the tragic consequences that fall out from Calyphas' opposition to his father's wishes. One of the rare autobiographical details given by the Narrator contains an explanation of how the playhouse has come to be his *mètier*: "I was young but, motherless and fatherless, was under Ned Alleyn's protection, lived with him" [p.16]. Theirs is basically a father-and-son relationship, like that between Tamburlaine and Calyphas, only that Alleyn has not sired the Narrator, but

adopted him. As well as taking the orphan under his wing, he sees to the boy's education by initiating him into the player's trade so that he will in time become "an arm-swinging actor" [p.15] like himself, just as Tamburlaine raises Calyphas to be a warrior in his father's image.

As a father figure Alleyn is someone to be rebelled against as much as someone to turn to for protection and guidance. In contrast to Calyphas, who rejects the martial values his father seeks to inculcate in him, the Narrator wishes to pursue his adoptive father's vocation but feels that Alleyn holds him back. The observation that Alleyn gave him the part of Wagner only grudgingly implies that he objects to the Narrator personating male characters. Wagner's emulation of Faustus would suggest that at the root of the objection there is Alleyn's fear of being upstaged by his foster son, allayed by giving him bit-parts. The frustration caused by Alleyn's egoticism and self-importance prompts the Narrator first to move out:

> I had left Ned Alleyn because he was to marry and also because he had puffed himself up with fame and gave too many orders [p.142];

and then change theatre company:

> I had abandoned the Lord Admiral's Men through dislike of Alleyn's imperiousness and had discovered the talent of song with Lord Strange's Men as also the skill of comic gallantry in what young noblemen's parts I was granted [pp.194-5].

It is interesting to note that the talents the Narrator develops with his new company, song and light comedy, differ sharply from those needed to deliver the ranting and bombastic speeches Alleyn specialises in, and which the Narrator might have cultivated if he had been given the chance to. The contrast between the frivolity of the former and the stridency of the latter is reminiscent of the clash between Calyphas' hedonistic pacifism and Tamburlaine's cult of military glory, a resemblance underscored by the echoes of the warlord's overweening demeanour in Alleyn's "imperiousness" and giving "too many orders."

From what may be gathered from the last excerpt the move from the Lord Admiral's Men to Lord Strange's Men serves to sink the Narrator's career rather than boost it. The generic reference to "young noblemen's parts" suggests typecasting in the role of the comic gallant, characters so undistinguishable from one another that they are not worth naming. The descent into obscurity is alluded to through the avoidance of the name *Calyphas* when the Narrator refers to his appearance in the revival of *Tamburlaine*, in contrast to the various mentions of *Zenocrate* when the two-part play is premièred (see

15.1.1.2). His voluntary namelessness also contrasts with the name-dropping he indulges in the following vignette:

> The tiring room the afternoon sun had baked was a cram of players, Dawson, Hawkes, Crampson, Digges, Birkin, Timmes, the rest, transformed now from Portugal and Spain their notabilities into men and boys of the street, cursing their thirst, thumping each other over tripped entrances, slowness on cues, a stutter, a finger-snapping momentary forgetting of a phrase put right by Haddock the bookholder [p.15].

Although the actors named do not have the fame of Ned Alleyn or Richard Burbage, the fact that they are named at all highlights the Narrator's status as a nonentity in the playhouse fraternity. His anonymity quite literally symbolises his failure to make a name for himself.

Alleyn consigns the Narrator to oblivion by keeping for himself the parts which might have made his adopted son famous. The counterpart to this in *Tamburlaine* is the instant in which the protagonist stabs his son to death, a killing which foreshadows Marlowe's death, both in its manner and motive. Marlowe, like Calyphas, is stabbed to death, largely because of his refusal to continue with his work as a spy. Unlike Calyphas, however, Marlowe's death adds to the fame he has acquired as a dramatist, and notoriety he has gained for his alleged atheism through the creation of the legend that he died in a tavern brawl. Calyphas, then, elides the Narrator's professional failure into Marlowe's murder, an elision that places the self-styled small actor and smaller play-botcher face to face with the great dramatist that is the subject of his chronicle.

15.1.2.2. *The Framing Function of* Pilia-Borza

Pilia-borza, a pimp with a taste for intrigue, stands in the same relation to Barabas, the Machiavellian anti-hero of Marlowe's black comedy *The Jew of Malta*, as Wagner does to Faustus in that he also tries to play the protagonist at his own game by trying to outdo him in criminal cunning. With the assistance of the prostitute he controls, Pilia-borza dupes Barabas' servant into blackmailing his master; but when that fails, he denounces the Jew to Ferneze, the governor of Malta. Although Pilia-borza's scheming contributes to Barabas' eventual downfall, Ferneze is the only one to benefit because the Jew succeeds in killing Pilia-borza and his accomplices before he receives his comeuppance. Pilia-borza's unsuccessful attempt to get the better of Barabas frames the Narrator's equally unsuccessful bid to become a popular playwright. After serving a brief and unproductive apprenticeship under Thomas Kyd, who seeks to instruct him "in the right fashioning of what he called a decasyllabon" [p.142], the Narrator teams up with an up-

and-coming William Shakespeare, who goes on to take over from Marlowe as the author of top-grossing plays at the expense of the Narrator. In trying his hand at dramaturgy, the Narrator plays Pilia-borza to Marlowe's Barabas and ends up by being bested by Shakespeare's Ferneze.

From the little he says about it one gathers that the Narrator's relationship with Shakespeare is much more stable than the one he has with Marlowe. For instance, the statement

> I was lodged now with the new player and playmaker (botcher, collaborator) from Warwickshire, a mild man but ambitious, who sucked me dry, but ever with a mild smile, of all I knew of the craft [p.195]

implies continued presence as opposed to the intermittence suggested in "Kit would sometimes come when Kyd was out to woo me into undressing with I love thee I love thee" [p.142]. As well as their regularity, the comparison of the Narrator's relationships through these two excerpts throws up differences as to their tenor. Marlowe's interest in him is primarily sexual, whereas Shakespeare's is essentially professional. The free repetition of *mild* in the first extract also opposes Shakespeare's blandness and gentleness to Marlowe's ardency and impetuousness conveyed through the repetition of *I love thee*. Yet what warrants most comment about the Narrator's professional partnership with Shakespeare is perhaps the inversion of the model-imitator relation which obtains between the Narrator and Alleyn on the one hand, and on the other between the Narrator and Marlowe insofar as the latter's plays set an example for his former boyfriend to follow. The précis of their partnership presents Shakespeare as a vampire-like figure who picks the Narrator's brains and then dumps him as soon as there is nothing more to learn from him. This would suggest that the language games which inform the convoluted prose style of his memoir is not a stylistic feature the Narrator has picked up from his collaborator, since "the bringing to prominence of the linguistic sign" is "one of the salient characteristics of [Shakespeare's] drama" (Elam 1984: 5). Rather, the weakness for word-play is a trait that Shakespeare picks up from the Narrator. In this regard, then, the association with Shakespeare is the watershed in the Narrator's professional life as the romance with Marlowe is in his love life.

Structurally, the Narrator's relationship with Shakespeare at once frames and is framed by the retrospective perspective brought to bear Marlowe's life. Their working partnership is a frame insomuch as the centrality accorded to language which characterises the narrative is an inheritance of his collaboration with Shakespeare. On

the other hand, it is also an inset story because it is embedded in the Narrator's memories of the times he is reminiscing. His association with Shakespeare, however, "is another story and its nudging and shouldering into this of Kit's harms wholeness and bids break the frame" [p.213], which is why earlier in the memoir the Narrator declares that it is "with reluctance" that he brings into the story "the man I lodged withal and was to be my associate for many years" [p.208]. The Latin tag he cites to justify bringing Shakespeare in, "*Natura abhorret vacuum*" [p.213], adumbrates his future ascendancy in the public playhouse: Marlowe's disappearance from the theatre leaves a vacuum Shakespeare fills in. The transition from the Marlovian to the Shakespearean playhouse is effected at the end of the passage depicting the experienced and budding playwright at work on *Henry VI Part One* [pp.208-10]. Needing time to compose his erotic mock-epic *Hero and Leander*, and tired of writing plays, Marlowe leaves the completion of the play to Shakespeare, its popular success helping to launch a career which will eventually surpass his predecessor's. The Narrator's reticence about Shakespeare may in this light be put down to jealousy: he might have filled in the vacuum Marlowe left behind if it had not been for the newcomer.

Shakespeare's status as Marlowe's heir is reflected in the similarities in the naming practices applied to the two dramatists. As with Marlowe, Shakespeare is called by the familiar clipped form of his forename, *Will*, though the Narrator mockingly appends the byname *of Warwickshire* to it whenever he uses it. A more striking similarity is the variety of forms the family name takes. When Shakespeare first comes to the notice of the playhouse fraternity, he is referred to as

> [o]ne newly up from the country trying his hand, Shogspaw or Shagspeer or some such name, [p.178]

later given the pseudo-philological gloss

> [h]is name, like all names, suffered a multiplicity of deformation, from Shagspaw to Shogspere, from Choxper to Jacquespere, which was the ingenious etymologising of a drunken Huguenot, of whom London had many [p.208].

Unlike Marlowe's family name, whose variegation is eventually resolved to the form we are familiar with today, Shakespeare's name not only is not standardised but its present-day form is avoided as well. Again, the avoidance of *Shakespeare* may be due to the Narrator's resentful perception of the bearer as the person responsible for nipping his incipient career in the bud after having taken advantage of him. Of the "jealous deformations of the great name to which the great name lends itself" (Burgess 1970:

94), *shagspeer* functions, from the Narrator's point of view, as an apposite nickname to the degree that it characterises Shakespeare as a person given to ill-using his colleagues. On the other hand, the non-standardisation of *Shakespeare* may be interpreted as indicative of its bearer's obscurity at the time the Narrator speaks of. A newcomer to both London and the playwright's craft, Shakespeare still has a long way to go to make his name as a top-notching purveyor of popular entertainment, although the familiar name he is called by transparently lexicalises his will to succeed. In the reported exchange "Kit asked what he should be called, and he replied that Will was enough" [p.208] leaves no doubt that Shakespeare is called *Will* because he desires to be called by that name, in contrast to his interlocutor, Marlowe, whom everybody takes the liberty of calling *Kit*. Thanks to its homonymy with the noun *will*, the name *Will* symbolises its bearer's determination to get to the top, even at the cost of frustrating the ambitions of his friends and colleagues, like the Narrator.

15.2. The Framing Function of Dido and Corinna

In addition to Bel-Imperia and Zenocrate, two other female characters are mentioned in connection with the Narrator. One of them, Helen of Troy, was discussed in 14.3.3, arriving at the conclusion that Faustus' bride is identifiable more with Thomas Walsingham than the Narrator, a conclusion suggested by Helen's destructiveness and the Narrator's unsuitability for the part. The other character is Dido, the eponymous lead role of *Dido Queen of Carthage*, and which the Narrator does not play either, despite his suitability for the part:

> There are good words here, [Alleyn] added, but alas they are not for me. I am not Aeneas. Though Jack here (meaning me) would be a fetching Dido [p.19].

Although the Narrator does not get to play Dido, the role nevertheless performs the same framing function as the ones he does play. Like the relation of Bel-Imperia with Andrea and Horatio on the one hand, and of Zenocrate with Tamburlaine on the other, that of Dido with Aeneas serves as a mirror for the Narrator's relationship with Marlowe. However, like Helen, Dido is identifiable with Walsingham as well as the Narrator so that the latter character effectively pitches Marlowe's two sexual partners against one another. The fact that the Narrator does not actually play Dido strongly suggests that he is the unsuccessful rival for Marlowe's attention, and that the role is symbolically transferred to Walsingham, as the role of Helen is following the Narrator's refusal to play her. The connection between the Narrator and Walsingham established

by their common identification with Dido is strengthen by their identification with Corinna, the love interest in Ovid's Fifth Elegy, part of which is quoted near the beginning of *A Dead Man in Deptford*. The romance Ovid's poetic persona conducts with Corinna is an adulterous relationship because she is married, like Helen's liaison with Paris; and although not adultery, Dido's romance with Aeneas is proscribed by the Olympian gods because it interferes with the destiny they have reserved for the Trojan refugee. Insofar as Walsingham and the Narrator may be regarded as rivals for Marlowe's love, infidelity characterises the amorous triangle they form, which casts the object of their rivalry into the female roles of Corinna and Dido. Yet Marlowe's two love affairs are transgressive not because they violate the sanctity of marriage, as none of those involved are married, but because they are both instances of unnatural love, the infatuation of a man for a boy in the one case, and the desire of a man for another man in the other.

15.2.1. The Framing Function of the Corinnae Concubitus *Elegy*

The point of departure of Kit's tragedy is Marlowe's chance encounter with Thomas Watson, the meeting between a celebrated and an aspiring poet. After being recognised as the author of the *Antigone*, "Sophocles done into Latin" [p.9], "Watson took from Kit's table a scrawled sheet" and "read aloud" the final lines of Fifth Elegy of the First Book of Ovid's *Amores* Marlowe has translated into English [pp.9-10]. The poem, sometimes known as *Corinnae Concubitus*, recounts a brief sexual encounter between Ovid's poetic persona and Corinna, a Roman matron with whom he has an affair: aroused on seeing her slip into his room for an assignment, he seizes her, strips her and admires her naked body before proceeding to ravish her. This sexual episode is reproduced twice in the narrative, though playing up the violence of Ovid's love-making at the expense of titillation. As seen in 15.1.1.2, The Narrator's recollection of the first time Marlowe has sex with him is a rape: the future playwright, in the throes of a consuming desire for Thomas Walsingham, finds the boy-actor

> alone, conning the part of the Queen in *Hamlet Revenge*, a half-finished play of Tom Kyd's (all these Toms, a world of toms like a night roof top). His eyes closed, muttering strange words and also groaning, he had me stripped and himself stripped and was soon at work that seemed strangely loveless [pp.35-6].

At Rheims Walsingham comes in for the same rough treatment as Marlowe:

> clattered up the stairs to the known room, finding it unlocked and, in strong moonlight, Tom awake and startled in his shirt. Kit called *Mon amour, me voici* and ripped off the

> shirt as well as his own bloodied raiment. What he then did was more brutal than before, making Tom howl [p.55].

Both passages are instantiations of a rape motif that takes its cue from the scenario represented in Ovid's elegy. Although converting a lovers' tryst into a sexual assault, the two episodes in *A Dead Man in Deptford* follow the same sequence of events: arousal, seizure, stripping and, though implied rather than stated, sexual union. What differentiate these scenarios is the circumstances which inform them: the time, the place and the actors.

The idea that the same scenario can be realised through different episodes calls to mind another work by Ovid, namely the *Metamorphoses*. As its title suggests, this work is a collection of salacious and irreverent recreations of ancient Greek and Latin myths united by the motif of physical transformation. Accordingly, the rape motif in *A Dead Man in Deptford* may be regarded as a metamorphosis of its Ovidian model insomuch as its instantiations involve a redirection of sexual desire. In the Fifth Elegy desire is heterosexual in that the subject experiencing it is male, and the object it is directed at female, whereas in the Narrator's two renderings of the scenario represented in the poem both the object and subject of desire are male. Each instantiation of the rape motif, moreover, differs from the other is that the object of Marlowe's desire is a boy in the first case, and an adult male in the second. The heterosexual union in which the elegy culminates is transmuted into a paederastic union in the first enactment of the motif, which in turn is transformed into an adult male-male one in the second.

In strengthening the link between the Narrator and Walsingham on the basis of its correspondences with Ovid's *Corinnae Concubitus* elegy, the rape motif encourages a re-reading of the Narrator's account of his appearance as Zenocrate discussed in 15.1.1.2, initially interpreted as the professional and sentimental acme of his life. The salient feature which the sexual assaults on the Narrator and Walsingham have in common the poem which frames these two episodes is the role of lust as the catalyst for the three sexual encounters depicted. Just as Ovid is driven to possess Corinna by his sudden desire for her, Marlowe is likewise driven to sexual violence by his passion for Walsingham, on both occasions. The paragraph recounting the outrage the Narrator suffers opens with "[i]t was this first encounter, I believe, that put Kit in a fever that had to be allayed" [p.34], the encounter referred to being Marlowe's earlier meeting with Walsingham at Seething Lane. The phrase *a fever that had to be allayed* refers cataphorically to *this lust not easily slaked* towards the end of the account of the

Narrator's appearance as Zenocrate, relating the latter phrase to the sexual desire Marlowe feels for Walsingham on seeing him for the first time. On this reading, then, Marlowe turns to the Narrator not because he finds the boy-actor engaging, but simply because Walsingham is not available. In the light of the revelation that the Narrator is a mere sexual makeshift for Marlowe, self-referring *his divine Zenocrate* in his account of his performance of *1 Tamburlaine* takes on a bitterly ironic tone. The irony emerges from the double perspective resulting from superimposing the point of view of the older, wiser and sadder Narrator-chronicler on that of the inexperienced young Narrator-actor. The literal reading of the appositional phrase expresses the Narrator's elation, inveigled by Marlowe's apparent interest in him, whereas the ironic reading, cued in by "[i]t was all Kit lusting," conveys the disillusioned hindsight of the disabused.

The Narrator's identification with Zenocrate is also undercut in the passage relating the resolution of the first crisis in Marlowe's relationship with Walsingham. Riding down from Cambridge to London together, Marlowe

> tried out to the fields, the wind and his companion:
>
> > *. . . this fair face and heavenly hue*
> > *Must grace his bed that conquers Asia*
> > *And means to be a terror to the world* [p.101],

the lines quoted taken from the beginning of the speech in which Tamburlaine proposes marriage to Zenocrate (*1 Tamburlaine* I ii 36-8). In the context of their reconciliation, the proposal is interpretable as a plea to Walsingham to return to Marlowe. Like the Narrator, Walsingham is addressed with words of Marlowe's composing, although with the difference that he has the privilege of having these words addressed to him directly from their author instead of through another person. What is more, Walsingham comes across as the inspiration for Tamburlaine's suit as well as its audience, better qualifying him as Marlowe's divine Zenocrate. The erotic subtext to the sentence rounding off the Narrator's memory of *1 Tamburlaine* is Marlowe-Tamburlaine turns to the Narrator-Zenocrate to slake his lust for Walsingham-Zenocrate, a reading which bears out the Narrator's lugubrious acknowledgement of having "confounded the periphery with the centre" regarding his relationship with Marlowe.

15.2.2. The Framing Function of Dido

Dido is the play Marlowe brings to the tavern conference held after the performance of *The Spanish Tragedy* as a sample of his work. Alleyn's rejection of the piece is framed

by his objection to the markedly paederastic tone of the beginning of its first scene, in which a doting Jupiter makes love to a Ganymede playing hard to get. The "sodomitical" "business of Jupiter and Ganymede" which puts the actor off the play also provides a prophetic frame for the reason he adduces for turning it down, namely his unsuitability for the part of Aeneas. The past tense of the verb phrase in "Jack here (…) would be a fetching Dido" is used to express a potential situation which is unlikely to come about. Although right for the part, the Narrator will not be playing it because the theatre company he belongs to will not be staging the play. However, the homoerotic subtext suggested by Alleyn's reference to the erotic play between Ganymede and Jupiter implies that the Narrator will not be playing Dido to Marlowe's Aeneas, but rather Ganymede to Marlowe's Jupiter. Like Zenocrate's union to Tamburlaine, the liaison between the Olympian god and his cup-bearer begins with a rape. In the myth Zeus, the Greek god identified with Jupiter, abducts Ganymede from the Trojan plain to make the youth his bedfellow (Graves 1960 [1955]: 116; Kershaw [ed.] 1990 [1951]: 159), paralleling the sexual assault which marks the beginning of the paederastic relationship between Marlowe and the Narrator. Like the Ganymede in *Dido*, who demands gifts in return for his sexual favours, the Narrator holds his lover off once their relationship is firmly established, though not in the spirit of sexual bargaining. Tiring of his role as Marlowe's catamite, the Narrator provokes him asking him for the reason for his lover's sexual preferences:

> Kit would sometimes come when Kyd was out to woo me into undressing with I love thee I love thee, but I was older and shaving once a week and conning the parts of young men, though this would be a sharp declension from the glory of Bel-Imperia and Zenocrate. I had come to hate the prying paws of the small gallants who came into the tiring room by wine emboldened, saying What hast under here? – fardingale or stuffed bodice – and a moment sweetheart, it is my need. So in something like gentleness I would thrust Kit away, and he would droop but bear small malice. One day I put it to him:
>
> —Why boys, why men, why never girls nor women?
>
> —There is a divine command, Lucretius calls on *Alma Venus*, delight of gods and men, and it may not be questioned. She commands me the way I must go and ever has, and nothing may be done.
>
> —And why does she, what is the reason in nature?
>
> —It is not in nature, *Alma Venus* rides all above her, one may say it is a rebuke to nature, we will go our own way nor follow the bestial law of breeding. And thus too we may escape from our mothers. To bed a woman, which I have never done, has a strong stench of incest.
>
> —You like not your mother?
>
> —I love her as a son should, but best from afar [p.142].

The earnest tone of the questions, which make up perhaps the longest intervention of the Narrator-as-character in his relation, provides a foil to the mercenary playfulness of Ganymede's demands. Instead of "a jewel for mine ear" and "a fine brooch to put in my hat" (*Dido* I i 46-47), the Narrator desires a satisfactory answer to the question why Marlowe uses him as a sexual object. Ganymede's milking of his powerful but foolishly prurient sugar daddy is yet another of the erotic games they indulge in, whereas the Narrator's interrogation of his oversexed seducer signals the end of their affair. Unlike Ganymede, forever the naughty but desirable little boy who will eventually yield to Jupiter's importunacy, the Narrator is growing up and out of his imposed role of catamite.

Alleyn's relinquishing the supporting role of *Dido*, "I am not Aeneas," leaves the part free to be assumed by Marlowe. Unlike the actor, the prospective playwright has a destiny to fulfil, although it is a tragic rather than a glorious one. The Narrator discounted, the role of Dido falls to Walsingham, who turns on the charm to induce Marlowe to remain in the Service in the same way the Queen of Carthage uses her womanly wiles to persuade Aeneas not to re-embark for Rome so that he can marry her. Perhaps the closest parallel between the two romantic attachments is to be found in a passage dealing with one of Marlowe's secret encounters with Walsingham on the grounds of the Scadbury estate at the time of the Babington plot:

> this night they lay together in a cottage which had been that of an estate woodman dismissed long dismissed. It was, as it were, an abode pared down to love, for there was little in it but a bed with straw-filled mattress and blankets of stitched motley pieces, the work of the woodman's wife. There was a fire fed by the ample branches and logs with which a leaning shed was well stocked, but, for fear that prowling Frizer might wonder even at nighttime smoke under the moon, it was seldom flinted to life, there being enough warmth in their conjoined and amorous bodies [p.84].

The meeting recalls Act III scene iv of *Dido* in which Aeneas and Dido shelter in a cave after being surprised by a storm, and in which she succeeds in seducing the Trojan hero. Also, the reference to "prowling Frizer" casts Walsingham's manservant into the role of Yarbas, Dido's suitor, who is as resentful of Dido's interest in Aeneas as Frizer is of his master's affair with Marlowe. The identification of Frizer with Yarbas sets up a second triangle that parallels the first: Frizer and Marlowe's rivalry for the attention of Walsingham as against Marlowe shuttling between Walsingham and the Narrator.

As well as similarities there are differences between the pair formed by Marlowe and Walsingham and that of Aeneas and Dido, fundamentally concerning the outcome of

each romance. True to its source, Marlowe's dramatisation of Book IV of the *Aeneid* ends with Dido vowing eternal enmity between her descendants and Aeneas' and committing suicide after he has abandoned her, her rejected lover Yarbas following suit. Although Marlowe may be regarded as walking out on Walsingham, disgusted by the revelation of the latter's part in the capture and execution of John Penry [p.251], he does so only after the notification that he is to quit Scadbury. Neither does Walsingham deflect his lover from his destiny, as Dido tries to deflect Aeneas from his, but rather helps him on to it by turning Marlowe out of his house when the knives are out for his guest. And Frizer, unlike Yarbas, is able to work off the long-standing grudge he nurses against Marlowe for stealing his master's affections, fostering the suspicion that Walsingham not only abandons Marlowe to his fate but is complicit in its fulfilment as well.

15.2.3. Other Parallels between the Narrator and Walsingham

The intertextual frame provided by the *Corinnae Concubitus* elegy impinges on the framing functions performed by the roles of Zenocrate and Dido. In the former case the re-interpretation of *his divine Zenocrate* prompted by the rape motif relegates the Narrator from Marlowe's beloved, the construction originally put on the phrase, to the unsuccessful rival for his love. In the latter case, the Aeneas-Dido frame foreclosed by "Jack here (...) would be a fetching Dido," the rape motif places the Narrator's relationship with Marlowe within the frame of Ganymede's teasing of Jupiter. The role of Aeneas' would-be seducer falls to Walsingham, though re-scripted. Dido-Walsingham not only succeeds in seducing Aeneas-Marlowe, she leads her victim on to the fulfilment of his destiny as well. The re-reading and re-scripting brought about by the rape motif uncover a relationship between Walsingham and the Narrator based on their sharing the same sexual partner, although at the time of their common involvement with Marlowe each is unaware of the other's existence.

Looking again at the named characters played by the Narrator, one becomes aware of another feature he shares with Walsingham. The shift from female to male dramatic roles signalled by his forgoing the part of Helen for that of Wagner parallels Walsingham's exchange of feminine for masculine social roles consequent on his inheriting the family estate (see 7.3.5 and 7.3.6). In both cases, moreover, the outcome of the process of re-masculinisation is the end of the relationship Marlowe maintains with each. Walsingham's announcement of his intention to marry doubles as a

declaration that their affair has come to an end, and that each has to go their separate ways, while the cold shoulder the Narrator turns to Marlowe's advances sends the message that he will no longer comply with his sexual demands, intimating that they are soon to go their separate ways. The most striking similarity between Walsingham and the Narrator, however, is the dissolution of gender distinctions which characterises their effeminacy. The negative feminine stereotype Walsingham embodies, the *femme fatale*, compounds misplaced feminine qualities with the masculine vices such a woman appropriates so that the effeminisation he undergoes is cancelled out by the masculinisation undergone by the destructive siren. The Narrator's sexual indeterminacy is consequent on the principal stock in trade of the Elizabethan boy-actor, his transvestism.

15.2.3.1. *The Framing Function of Transvestism*

Although implied by the names of the female characters the Narrator plays, there are few overt references to cross-dressing, and these are invariably overlaid with paederastic associations. One such reference is made in the fragment cited in 15.2.2, in which the grilling Marlowe is subjected to regarding his weakness for boys is given edge by the contempt for the roués "who came into the tiring room by wine emboldened, saying What hast under here? – fardingale or stuffed bodice." Another reference is made earlier in the narrative, in the glimpse afforded backstage after the stage presentation of *The Spanish Tragedy* Marlowe is invited to:

> I was unwigging myself, wiping off the white from my chubby boy's face, easing myself out of bodice and fardingale. Kit saw me an instant in a boy's nakedness and seemed to glow [pp.14-5].

The lust provoked by the Narrator exposing himself is resonant of

> Sometime a lovely boy in Dian's shape,
> With hair that gilds the water as it glides,
> Crownets of pearl about his naked arms,
> And in his sportful hands an olive-tree,
> To hide those parts which men delight to see
> (*Edward II* I i 61-65),

the *Grand Guignol* to the revels Gaveston imagines himself organising for the King as he waits for him. Dressing up the object of desire as a woman is a means of spicing up a casual paederastic relationship.

Judging from his reaction to it, "Kit (...) seemed to glow," the sight of the Narrator stepping out of his costume is what brings the boy-actor to Marlowe's attention. As the

clause “much taken by Ned Alleyn” suggests, during the performance Marlowe’s interest is caught by the actor in the lead male role rather than the one in the supporting female role. It is only when he takes off the woman’s attire he has been wearing for the play that the Narrator becomes an attractive proposition Marlowe, tacitly acknowledged in the misogynist reformulation of the endearment the latter addresses to him at the supper party:

> you luscious Bel-Imperia that was, nay, you are better as you are, women are but machines for breeding, boys are perfection. To be young and of lucent skin and luminous of eye, the flesh not yet disfigured with the gross hairiness of what is termed maturity, to be of youth’s sweet breath and unpustular and unblemished by fatty comedones [p.25].

Marlowe’s ode to the physical beauty of boys brought on by the compliment, together with the fleeting glimpse of the Narrator “in a boy’s nakedness” which inspires it, foreshadows his imminent encounter with Thomas Walsingham. While the twinge of desire felt at seeing the Narrator naked is a mild prelude to the emotional turmoil Marlowe is thrown into on seeing Walsingham for the first time, the lyrical description of the charms the pre-pubescent boy holds for him acts as a blazon for the Narrator, anticipating the more complete and personalised blazon written for his future rival for Marlowe’s affections. The emerging role of the Narrator as precursor of Walsingham in the capacity of object of erotic desire for Marlowe is also assisted by his professional transvestism. Asked, on his short visit to his family in Canterbury, whether he has met any girls, Marlowe, in the manner of a reply, “resexed, as in one of his poems, Mr Walsingham into a lady of luscious hair, fine carriage, great prospects” [p.38]. The transvestism, whether actual or imagined, sudden infatuation and an effeminising idealisation of male beauty shared by the two relationships make the incipient age-graded union between Marlowe and the Narrator and the prospective egalitarian union between Marlowe and Walsingham yet another instantiation of the type-anti-type relation which help to structure the narrative.

The identification of Marlowe’s paederastic liaison with the Narrator as an antecedent to his homosexual affair with Walsingham is also intertextually framed by the discussion, in the tavern conference held after the performance, on *Dido*, the play the Narrator did not get to act in. The frivolous dalliance of Jupiter with Ganymede Alleyn takes exception to prefigures the star-crossed romance between Dido and Aeneas (Weil 1977: 15), pointing up the double parallelism between Marlowe’s relationship with the Narrator and that with the god and his cup-bearer, and between Marlowe’s

relationship with Walsingham and the Trojan hero and the Carthaginian queen. To a large degree the drunken passes Marlowe makes at the Narrator at the supper party is a re-enactment of Jupiter's efforts to make Ganymede compliant to his wishes, notably in "[t]hen, grinning like a fool, he stroked my unfeeding hand, which was to his right" [p.25]. Whereas the term *fool* equates Marlowe with Jupiter on account of their fatuous deportment, the detail that the Narrator is seated to Marlowe's right equates him with Ganymede in terms of their standing with regard to their respective suitors insomuch as being positioned on the right of a prominent individual is a mark of special favour (Wildeblood and Brinson 1965: 120). The drunken carousal at the supper party, then, marks the high point of the Narrator's relationship with Marlowe, and not, as *his divine Zenocrate* gives to understand, the time he plays the lead female role in *Tamburlaine*. In the following encounter with Marlowe he is raped, the first of a series of furtive assignments, interlaced with the occasional drunken confession.

15.2.3.2. *Transvestism and Effeminacy*

The Narrator's passivity to the rough treatment he subsequently receives from Marlowe differs sharply from Ganymede's ability to take advantage of Jupiter's weakness for him, an exploitative streak strongly reminiscent of Walsingham. This divergence from the intertextual frame provided by *Dido* nevertheless seems to lend support to the effeminising effect the transvestite theatre is supposed to have on the male theatre-goer (Levine 1986: 132-5; Orgel 1989: 15-7; Chedgzoy 2004: 255). Central to the charge that the public playhouse is a source of universal effeminisation is the belief that the boy-actors who dress and behave as women onstage will become women themselves, arousing the carnal appetites of the male spectators and inciting them to "to play the sodomite or worse" (quoted in Levine 1986: 134; Orgel 1989: 17), with the consequent adulteration of their gender identity. This line of mimetic reasoning is borne out by the unwanted attention of the dissolute theatre-goers the Narrator complains of in the fragment quoted in 15.2.2. Fired by his appearance as woman, the small gallants seek him out after the performance for his sexual favours in a homosexual travesty of heterosexual love-making in which he is condemned to play the role of catamite on account of his transvestism. In the light of the mealy-mouthed qualification "or worse," the role of the catamite is more of a degradation for the one that performs it than that of the sodomite. The latter at least conserves some semblance of masculinity by penetrating his partner, even though he is another male. The catamite, by contrast, is

relegated to the passive, feminine role of being penetrated, and for this reason has gone further down the road of effeminisation than his more active partner. Accordingly, the Narrator is more effeminate than the fops who importune him, an effeminacy enhanced by the female attire he is wearing.

In Marlowe's case, however, the attribution of his paederastic relationship with the Narrator to the evil example set by the spectacle of transvestite actors onstage is only possible by resorting to procrustean argument. To begin with, his reaction on seeing the Narrator naked makes it clear that Marlowe is sexually attracted to him precisely because he is a boy, not because he is surrogate woman. The panegyric delivered at the supper table on the perfection of boys, moreover, begins with a proclamation on the superiority of boys over women, dehumanised as mere "machines for breeding." When Marlowe rapes the Narrator, who is interrupted while learning the lines of a female part for another play, it is to sate his lust for Walsingham, and not to indulge in the fantasy that he is having sex with a woman. Apart from the politic re-sexing of Walsingham, transvestism is conspicuously absent from the affair he seduces Marlowe into, and with it the effeminacy transvestism supposedly encourages. Above all, there is Marlowe's own testimony that "I am drawn to my own sex" [p.56], boys as well as men, rationalised in the Lucretian explanation given to the Narrator that he is heeding the call of Venus. Marlowe's homosexuality, as suggested in 6.2.3, therefore has its basis on the gender-separatist view that the strongest emotional bonds exist among men, which may be homoerotic or homosocial. Boys may be the ideal substitutes for women on the stage, but not in bed: as sexual partners they surpass women.

The belief that boys make convincing women implies that boys and women share features in common. As Barbour puts it (1995: 1008), boys "make good figures for women because both boys and women are soft and dependent in relation to men." The softness Barbour makes reference to comes across in the qualities Marlowe lists, the lucent skin and hairless flesh attributed to boys being physical features traditionally valued in women as well. The blazon Marlowe recites in the Narrator's honour supplements Thomas Watson's pedantic observation on the appeal boys have for the paederastically inclined, namely "their delectability and amenability" as well as their "[a]bility (...) to arouse" [p.10], again qualities valued in women. Dependence on men, the second trait boys share with women, is displayed in the Narrator's case by his adoption by Alleyn on the one hand, and on the other the sporadic visits Marlowe pays him to have sex. Both his career on the boards, along with the transvestism attendant on

it, and his affair with Marlowe are impositions from adults he must learn to put up with. The Narrator is a transvestite and catamite not of choice, but of circumstance.

What merits attention about the blazon dedicated to the Narrator is its similarity to blazons describing Marlowe and Walsingham. The boy's "lucent skin" and "flesh not yet disfigured with the gross hairiness of (...) maturity" is strongly reminiscent of the "flesh was smooth" and the "little hair" on "his bared body" observed in Marlowe, while the adjective *luscious* is applied to both the Narrator and Walsingham, in "you luscious Bel-Imperia" and "a lady of luscious hair" respectively. The correspondences in physical detail point to a deeper connection between the transvestism of the boy-actor and the homosexual affair Marlowe and Walsingham engage in, namely the collapse of gender distinctions through the adulteration of masculine qualities by feminine ones. As argued in 6.3.5, in male-male egalitarian unions the active sodomite and passive catamite are interchangeable roles in that, being endowed with the same organs, the sexual partners can turns in penetrating and being penetrated. This interchangeability of sexual roles makes such unions even more detrimental to male gender identity than age-graded male-male unions, in which there is a strict division of roles which upholds the distinction between masculine and feminine. The pre-pubescent boy-actor, on the other hand, still belongs to the common gender of childhood, an age largely controlled by women, and therefore part of the feminine world (Orgel 1989: 11), which explain the physical traits boys and women are thought to share. Rather than effeminate, then, the transvestite boy-actor is better described as epicene, that is, impossible to tell which sex he has (Barbour 1995: 1014). The indeterminate sex of the boy-actor disrupts gender distinctions in the same way the exchange of sexual roles in egalitarian male-male unions do, a disruption often reinforced in many plays by writing in a twist in the plot whereby a female character dresses up and passes herself off as a man, and giving rise to the spectacle of a boy playing a woman playing the man.

The switch from playing female parts to assuming male roles accompanying the Narrator's passage from boyhood to adolescence coincides with the end of his paederastic relationship with Marlowe. The detail that "I was (...) shaving once a week" implies that the Narrator is losing the boyish charm which drew Marlowe to him in that the flesh is becoming "disfigured with gross hairiness of (...) maturity." However, the clause "I thrust Kit away" in response to "Kit would sometimes come (...) to woo me to undressing" leaves no doubt as to the fact that it is the Narrator that decides to put an end to the affair. Judging from the remark that "the sodomitical seek to avoid ocular

discourse" [p.4], made by the aged Narrator-as-chronicler by way of explanation of Marlowe's habit of averting his gaze, the end of the affair also signals the end of his experience with homosexuality in general in that the generic term *the sodomitical* is applied to Marlowe while excluding the Narrator. The transition from homosexuality to heterosexuality which takes place as the Narrator grows older conforms to the dominant medical theory of the early Modern period that the difference between men and women is one in degree of perfection (Orgel 1989: 13-14; Barbour 1995: 1008-9). According to this view, women are incomplete men because their development towards perfection has been arrested at some point, which assigns stability to adult male body and lability to the female. The Narrator's epicene boyhood, then, is a period of feminine instability marked by his transvestism and his role as Marlowe's occasional catamite. True to the idea that doing leads to being, playing male parts on the stage helps to bring about the completion of the Narrator's masculine identity, even though at the price of becoming a nonentity.

15.3. The Identity of the Narrator

The Narrator's appearances onstage concealing his imperfect male identity under the guise of a fictional female one brings to mind his appearance in the Shakespeare comedy mentioned in the epilogue to his memoir:

> My own name you will find, if you care to look, in the folio of Black Will's plays, put out by his friends Heming and Condell in 1623. In the comedy of *Much Ado About Nothing*, by some inadvertency, I enter with Leonato and others under my true identity and not, as it should be, the guise of Balthasar to sing to ladies that they sigh no more [p.269].

The fragment just cited is important because it raises the issue of personal identity, more specifically the question of the Narrator's identity, concealed throughout the narrative behind the various dramatic roles he assumes during his career as an actor. If one takes up the offer to look his name up in the First Folio, the oversight referred to turns out to be the inadvertent substitution of *Balthasar* by the name of the actor playing the character in the stage direction "[e]nter Prince, Leonato, Claudio and Jacke Wilson" (Best, Michael, 2005). The familiar name *Jack* is used to identify the Narrator near the beginning of his memoir, in Ned Alleyn's rejection of *Dido* already quoted in the introduction to 15.2.2:

> There are good words here, he added, but alas they are not for me. I am not Aeneas. Though Jack here (meaning me) would be a fetching Dido [p.19].

The purpose of the aside embedded in the utterance is to indicate that ostensive *Jack here* refers to the Narrator, and not Alleyn's brother, Jack Alleyn, also present at the conversation from which the excerpt above is taken, so that the reader knows that the Narrator's forename is John. Returning to the reference to his appearance in *Much Ado About Nothing*, the Narrator's family name is anticipated by Shakespeare's sobriquet *Black Will* inasmuch as the familiar name may be regarded as an end-clipped form of *Wilson* as well as *William*. On following up the lead given, the Narrator's name turns out to be Jack Wilson, identified as an actor from the Lord Chamberlain's Men (Burgess 1987: 7).

The onomastic delving does not end with the discovery of the Narrator's demotic full name. Turning to the *dramatis personae* of *Much Ado About Nothing*, one finds that, in some editions of the play, *Balthasar*, the character the Narrator plays, appears immediately below *Antonio* (Craig (ed) 1911: 364). Reading downwards, the first letters of the two character names form *A.B*, the initials of *Anthony Burgess* Burgess habitually used as a reviewer, and with which signs off the Author's Note after the novel. *Jack Wilson*, in other words, names the persona under which the author of *A Dead Man in Deptford* appears in the narrative, revealing the memoir to be an elaborate confidence trick played on the reader. However, as anticipated by "I enter (…) under my true identity," the Narrator and the author are namesakes as Burgess's birth name is John Wilson. Consequently, just as the Narrator comes on as Jack Wilson to play Balthasar, so too Burgess appears in his novel as Jack Wilson to play his fictionalised namesake.

In a way Burgess's personation of the long-forgotten Elizabethan actor on whom he builds fictional persona is a means of recovering his original identity. *Anthony Burgess*, formed by his confirmation name and his mother's maiden name (Burgess 1987: 7), is the pen name by which the individual christened John Wilson is known to the reading public. Yet, as Burgess himself (1987: 6) points out, his pen name has supplanted his birth name: "those who called me Jack are all dead. Those who call me John are getting old. I answer to Anthony and, in Italy, to Antonio." Accordingly, like the Narrator, whose name is concealed behind the various dramatic personae he assumes, Burgess hides his private identity behind the public persona of *Anthony Burgess*. Paradoxically, given the widespread currency of the pen name, the act of self-revelation with which the narrative ends is still a form of concealment.

The revelation that the Narrator of *A Dead Man in Deptford* is in fact its real-life author is made in the final paragraph of the book. With the announcement "[y]our true author speaks now" [p.269] Burgess divests himself of his fictional persona and definitively dispels the fiction so painstakingly created that the narrative is based on a seventeenth-century manuscript. The act of taking off his mask is anticipated in the foregoing paragraph, in the meta-literary observation "[s]o a useless truth obtrudes on to a most ravishing lie," which follows the hints the Narrator drops as regards his identity. The "useless truth" refers to the unintentional substitution of *Jack Wilson* for *Balthasar*, and the "ravishing lie" to the fictionalised account of Christopher Marlowe's life rendered by Jack Wilson, a.k.a Anthony Burgess, through Jack Wilson, the persona built on the actor of that name. In this context *lie* is synonymous with *fiction*, echoing Plato's strictures on poetic fictions which give an illusion of reality (1997: 61-2)[61] popularised by the dictum Philip Sidney refutes, that "poets are liars" (Dorsten [ed] 1966: 52). The hypothesis on Marlowe's death the Narrator constructs in *A Dead Man in Deptford* is in reality a fiction devised by his namesake.

The final paragraph is in effect a curtain speech delivered by the author-actor to crave the audience's indulgence for whatever faults there are in the play they have just seen. This, too, is prefigured in the narrative, concretely in the speech given after a gala performance of *The Jew of Malta*:

> It seemed to me that the epilogue Alleyn, great nose plucked off, spoke to the court sneered at absent Kit:
>
> > *It is oure feare, dreade sovereign, we have bin*
> > *Too tedious; neither can't be lesse than sinne*
> > *To wronge your princely patience. If we have,*
> > *Thus lowe dejected, we youre pardon crave,*
> > *And if aught here offend your eare and sighte*
> > *We onlie acte and speake what others write* [pp.226-7].

Jack Wilson the Narrator leaves the stage with the request to "[l]et me lie down and, fair or foul reader, say farewell" [p.269], to return again as Jack Wilson the author, to justify "the ill-made disguise" he has just put off:

> The disguise is ill-made not out of incompetence but of necessity, since the earnestness of the past becomes the joke of the present, a once living language is turned into the stiff archaism of puppets.

[61] From the Wordsworth edition of Davies and Vaugh's translation.

Alleyn departs leaves the stage as Barabas and returns, "great nose plucked off," as himself to deliver the curtain speech. The main difference is that Jack Wilson/Anthony Burgess cannot explain away the faults of the play he has just performed in with the excuse of acting and speaking what others write, because he has acted and spoken what he himself has written. The author's curtain speech is in many respects an extension of the *theatrum mundi* conceit which helps to structure the narrative. By assuming, and finally openly divesting himself of, the fictional persona of an actor turned biographer, Burgess shares in the self-duplicating character of the play-within-a-play device expressed by "small actor and smaller play-botcher," in real life as well as his imaginary recreation of late sixteenth-century England.

15.4. Recapitulation

In the fiction the Narrator performs two well-differentiated though interconnected functions. The first is to provide a point of view for the events narrated. His retrospect on Marlowe's life is a refutation of the popularised image of its recipient as an undesirable whose excesses ultimately brought him to a sticky end. Instead, Marlowe is presented as the victim of a character assassination that preceded his actual murder, which thanks to bad name he had been given was passed off as an unintentional killing in a drunken brawl, although the alternative version posited rests largely on unproven inferences drawn from the few established facts the Narrator possesses. The second function performed by the Narrator is structural. *A Dead Man In Deptford* is organised as a succession of superimposed identities: the individual called John Wilson adopts the public persona of Anthony Burgess, who in turn adopts the literary persona of an obscure actor turned journeyman, who in turn assumes various roles in the course of his acting career.

The *mise en abyme* of layered personations, moreover, cuts across the division separating fiction from reality. For instance, in the Author's Note, which unequivocally lies outside the compass of the fiction, Burgess mentions the sources he consulted for the writing of the book, with special reference to Hugh Ross Williamson's *Kind Kit* and Charles Nicholl's *The Reckoning*. On reading these books, we find Burgess has followed them very closely: the Walsingham-Marlowe-Frizer triangle is lifted from Williamson's highly novelised biography while Marlowe's career as a spy owes much to Nicholl's research into the Elizabethan intelligence service. Indeed, the borrowings from these two authors are so extensive as to verge on plagiarism. Viewed against the

background of the early Modern playhouse, however, it becomes apparent that Ross and Nicholl are to Burgess as Holinshed was to Shakespeare, namely as material to be transformed into an original work. By using them as source books, Burgess takes on the part of an early modern playwright during the composition of his novel: that is, he already assumes the role of the Narrator while writing the fiction, aided by the coincidence that the demotic form of his official name is the same as the Elizabethan player on whom he bases his fictional persona. The final disclosure of the novel as a deception played on the reader lends credence to the role he assumes rather than diminishes it. In keeping with the epistemological implications of the play within the play, early modern drama builds an illusion of reality on the stage ultimately to expose the play as an illusion. Following this tradition, Burgess produces a text which apes the style of seventeenth-century prose, only to reveal it to be a travesty of "a once living language (...) turned into the stiff archaism of puppets" [p.269]. The revelation also carries the corollary "small player and smaller play-botcher" is ultimately applicable to Burgess himself.

Since they straddle the realms of fiction and reality, the embedded identities which structure the novel contribute to an elision of these two spheres. The confusion resulting from this conflating of the fictional and real worlds in turn relates "small player and smaller play-botcher" to the sense of moral and spiritual disorientation conveyed by the Narrator. The *theatrum mundi* conceit, which the subtext to the conjoined phrases makes allusion to, is a formulation of the moral and spiritual crisis of early modern Europe, the period the memoir is purported to have been written in. Although, as stated in the introduction to Chapter 13, the best-known expression of the commonplace in the English-speaking world is "[a]ll the world's a stage", the actual wording of the Narrator's reference to his calling is resonant of another much-quoted soliloquy from Shakespeare. The grammatical realisation of *small* in the second noun phrase, together with the pejorative connotations of *botcher*, suggests its figurative meaning of «unimportant» or «insignificant» is the preferred one in this particular context. The sense of belittlement given to the adjective links "small actor" to the "poor player", who "struts and frets his hour upon the stage" (*Macbeth* V v 24-5): *player* is a synonym of *actor*, and, given the proximity of *idiot*, *poor* means 'incompetent' rather 'deserving pity,' which would make it synonymous with *small*. The comparison of life with theatrical performance represents a nihilistic interpretation of the *theatrum mundi*: humankind is a benighted actor appearing in a meaningless spectacle which ends

ineluctably in death. The agnostic implications of Macbeth's soliloquy seem apposite to Marlowe's life as the Narrator tells it. The last word of the speech is the same one which ends *Much Ado About Nothing*, mentioned in the Narrator's epilogue. The title refers to the central incident of the play, namely the commotion caused by the aspersions cast on Hero's chastity and which are eventually proved false. Marlowe is likewise the object of malicious gossip, but, unlike Hero, he is unable to shake off the bad reputation he has as a result of these rumours. In this regard, then, ‹nothing› defines Marlowe's life as an absurd tragedy triggered by unfounded hearsay. On the other hand, the title may be understood as a modest description of the play. The comedy is conceived as a harmless entertainment, with no other view in mind than amusing the audience. In that case, *nothing* refers to Burgess's attitude to his own novel. *A Dead Man in Deptford* is accordingly a tour de force, with no other end than impressing the reader with a show of the author's ingenuity and learning.

16. Conclusion

Weil (1977: 22) begins her study of *The Jew of Malta* by quoting Walter Benjamin's definition of a proverb, "a ruin which stands on the site of an old story and in which a moral twines about a happening like ivy around a wall" (1970: 108), to justify her reading of the play as "an expanded proverb." The metaphor, with modifications, is also applicable to *A Dead Man in Deptford* ―and for that matter the numerous novelisations of the Christopher Marlowe affair referred to in the introductory chapter to this thesis― and for this reason makes an apt starting point for the summing up of the analysis carried out on the novel in the preceding fourteen chapters.

The site occupied by Burgess's fictional memoir is, of course, the story of Christopher Marlowe's life, and the happening the death in suspicious circumstances of the poet-playwright inspiring the story. By the same token the ruin standing on the site is the scraps of the story which have come down to us, notably the findings of the coroner's inquest into the Deptford affray, the allegations of atheism and blasphemy brought against Christopher Marlowe in the Baines note, the accusations of atheism made against him in Thomas Kyd's letter to Sir John Puckering (Boas 1940: 242-3; Bakeless 1942: 114; Steane 1965: 7; Nicholl 1992: 43-5; Riggs 2004: 37), the governor of Flushing's letter concerning Christopher Marlowe's arrest for coining (Nicholl 1992: 235-6; Downie 2000: 21-2; Hopkins 2000: 48; Riggs 2004: 36), Thomas Watson's gaol delivery following the Hog Lane incident (Eccles 1934: 22-4; Boas 1940: 236; Bakeless 1942: 100-2; Steane 1965: 16; Williamson 1972: 176-7; Nicholl 1992: 179; Bolt 2004: 151; Riggs 2004: 32), Robert Greene's taunts in *Perimedes the Blacksmith* and the *Groatsworth of Wit*, the certificate of good conduct issued by the Privy Council instructing the university authorities of Cambridge to reverse their decision not to award Christopher Marlowe his M.A. degree, and the record of scholarship payments at Cambridge and the buttery account book (Boas 1940: 12-5; Bakeless 1942: 71-5; Nicholl 1992: 99-100)[62], not to mention dark allusions to Christopher Marlowe's violent end in the popular literature produced shortly after his death[63]. Finally, the ivy growing

[62] The references to secondary sources identify documents which have not been mentioned or discussed in the thesis, although fragments from them have been written into *A Dead Man in Deptford*.

[63] Touchstone's observation on the effect the poor reception of his work has on a poet, "[w]hen a man's verses cannot be understood, nor a man's good wit seconded with the forward wit understanding, it strikes a man more dead than a great reckoning in a little room" (*As You Like It* III iii 10-3), may be read as an indirect reference to the killing of Christopher Marlowe on the strength of the echo of Barabas' "[i]nfinite riches in a little room" (*The Jew of Malta* I i 37) in the main clause and the attribution of the poet's metaphorical death to "a great reckoning," the ostensible cause of the quarrel which ended in the killing (Nicholl 1992: 75).

around the wall of the ruin represents the bout of moralising the incident brought on among the victim's strait-laced contemporaries (Boas 1940: 279-81; Bakeless 1942: 143-50; Steane 1965: 3-4; Nichol 1992: 65-8), as well as the prolific spate of conspiracy theories among present-day critics, biographers and amateur sleuths. As Steane puts it (1965: 3), "[a]t the heart of any discussion about Marlowe's life is the knowledge we have of his death," occurred "in circumstances which have exercised scholars, preachers, playwrights, novelists and gossips to an extraordinary degree." The "imaginative replies," as Steane describes (1965: 24) the numerous theories put forward to answer the many questions raised by these circumstances, suggest fiction rather than biographical speculation. It also leads to a reformulation of Benjamin's metaphor of the ruin overgrown with ivy to make it applicable to novelisation and academic enquiry alike. Accordingly, if a proverb is the ruin of a story, a novel like Burgess's *A Dead Man in Deptford* and a piece of historical research like Charles Nicholl's *The Reckoning* are reconstructions of the Christopher Marlowe story which have incorporated the documentary testimonies of the playwright's acts and opinions, the "remains" of that story, into the new structure raised by the novelist and the historian.

It is worth pointing out that when Steane speaks of imaginative replies, he has the work of the Marlovian scholar in mind rather than the inventions of the novelist. For Downie (2000: 13), however, the novelised and scholarly reconstructions of Christopher Marlowe's life are part of the same "(dis)honourable tradition" in which "writers and critics (...) to pontificate about Marlowe's life, his character, and his artistic intentions, regardless of the exiguity of the documentary evidence on which they base their accounts," with the result that "researchers' hunches quickly become transmogrified (...) into hard 'facts'." Since "[w]e know next to nothing about Christopher Marlowe" (Downie 2000: 13), the fictional and scholarly retellings of the dramatist's story consist almost entirely of what their authors have thought up, making them accounts "of *what might have been* the 'facts' of Marlowe's life[64]" (Downie 2000: 14) based on nothing more than wild speculation. If the theories advanced by a historian like Nicholl "might be nothing more than a fiction of his own constructing" (Downie 2000: 14), then a novelisation by a writer like Burgess constitutes a halfway house whereby theory may be presented under the guise of fiction. Where Christopher Marlowe is concerned, it

[64] Emphasis in the original.

seems, scholarly speculation and novelisation often amount very much to the same thing.

The complicity Downie sees between the novelist and the academic is embodied in the quotations of the guardedly meta-literary opening sentence of *A Dead Man in Deptford* and the first paragraph of the introduction to *The Reckoning* with which he prefaces his essay, namely

> [y]ou must and will suppose (fair or foul reader, but where's the difference?) that I suppose a heap of happenings that I had no eye to eye knowledge of or concerning [p.3],

and

> [i]s this a true story?
>
> Yes, in the sense that it is fact rather than fiction. The people in it are real people, the events I describe really happened, the quotations are taken verbatim from documents or books of the period. Where there is a dialogue I have reconstructed it from reported speech. I have not invented anything (1992: 3).

To appreciate the correspondences between the two books more fully, however, it is necessary to expand the epigraphs taken from them: the metaphysical excursus which follows the first sentence in the case of Burgess's novel, and the second paragraph of the introduction in the case of Nicholl's book. Starting with the first quotation, Burgess, through his eponymous first-person narrator Jack Wilson, justifies the recourse to supposition with the generalisation that what one knows about something is largely supposition: "What though a man supposes is oft (...) of the right and very substance of his seeing." The justification is followed by the ontological problem illustrated by the comings and goings of the philosopher's cat, namely whether an entity exists only by virtue of the beholder who perceives it, or whether it exists irrespective of the presence or absence of that beholder. The sentence following the allegory, "[b]ut of the time of the cat's absence a man may also rightly suppose that it is fully and corporeally in the world to its last whisker," not only makes clear that the second option is chosen, but also solves the epistemological problem the option chosen gives rise to, namely that the cat is as good as non-existent when it is out of the philosopher's sight. The solution advanced is that it is perfectly permissible for the philosopher to speculate on the cat's possible movements during its absences on the strength of his previous experience of it. And if, in the absence of hard facts, speculation is a legitimate course of action for the philosopher to follow, then why should it not be so for the Narrator as well? Such is the query implicit in the statement "[s]o let it be with my cat or Kit," which ends the

digression and introduces the subject of Jack Wilson's narrative. By having the imaginary author of *A Dead Man in Deptford* speculate about the vicissitudes which befall Marlowe as a result of the paucity of firm evidence to go on, Burgess places his fictionalised namesake before an epistemological quandary analogous to that of the Marlovian scholar, which Nicholl (1992: 3) sums up in the second paragraph of his introduction:

> Yet these true things are only part of the story, pieces of a jigsaw. Many other pieces are missing, lost between then and now [This book] (...) is an attempt to fill in the spaces: with new facts, with new ways of seeing old facts, with probabilities and speculations and sometimes with guesswork. In a sense I am not telling a story but presenting a complex and rather painstaking argument. I am trying to get some meaning out of what remains, to reconnect it. It is as true as I can make it.

Besides an important qualification to the assurance made in the preceding paragraph that *The Reckoning* deals with "fact rather than fiction," Nicholl's caveat is at times couched in terms reminiscent of the modified version of Benjamin's ruin-metaphor. The necessity to supplement what meagre facts are available with hypotheses based on such inferences as can be drawn from them makes Nicholl's book a reconstruction of "what remains" of the story. In many respects the Narrator's supposing of "the heap of happenings" he relates is as much a novelisation of the literary scholar's research into Christopher Marlowe as it is of the dramatist's life.

The connection between Marlovian scholarship and novelisation is acknowledged in the Author's Note to *A Dead Man in Deptford*. Like Nicholl, Burgess claims that "[a]ll the historical facts [written into the novel] are verifiable" [p.271] insofar as these are recorded in the secondary sources consulted for the preliminary research for the book. In acknowledging these sources, the novelist casts himself into the role of the researcher who attempts to put together the jigsaw of Christopher Marlowe's life, only that the findings of his research is placed at two removes from referential reality: at a fictional as well as a conjectural remove. After recognising his debt to Nicholl and Hugh Ross Williamson's *Kind Kit*, Burgess concludes with

> [t]he scholarly delving [into Christopher Marlowe's life] will go on, and other novels will be written, but the true truth – the *verità verissima* of the Neapolitans – can never be known. The virtue of a historical novel is its vice – the flatfooted affirmation of possibility as fact [pp.271-2].

The second sentence of the excerpt may be regarded as a novelist's sophistical response *in utramque partem questionis* to Downie's objection to the ease with which fiction passes for theory, and with which both become fact. While conceding that his novel on

Christopher Marlowe asserts rather than raises a possibility, its vice, the statement also defends the writer's prerogative to treat possibility as if it were fact. Unlike the researcher, the novelist is not required to substantiate the findings of his or her study with evidence, a licence which constitutes the virtue of the historical novel. Burgess's Marlowe is a construct, like all the referents of *Christopher Marlowe* (Downie 2000: 13), though a fictional construct, and as such makes no ostensible claim of resemblance to the biographical bearer of the name.

The ceaseless, and ultimately fruitless, "scholarly delving" Burgess refers to, however, extends as well as provides him with the opportunity to argue on both sides of the question Downie addresses. The crux of Downie's essay is that the tendency to confuse the construct 'Christopher Marlowe' with the biographical Christopher Marlowe constitutes the paradigm case of misprisions of this type. While conceding the distinction between construct and person, Burgess seems to imply that the person is irrecoverable, and that as a result the constructs created by novelist and academic alike are the only thing we have of him. Paraphrasing the Narrator, what a man supposes of Christopher Marlowe is the substance of what he knows about the playwright. Perversely, the net effect of the constant scholarly and fictional interest in him tends, as Henderson notes (1972: 7), to obscure rather than clarify the issue of his life, because they result in a profusion of conflicting versions. Instead of bringing us closer to the true truth, the efforts of scholars and the fantasy of writers of fiction actually causes it to recede from us.

The never-ending succession of academic research and works of fiction Burgess envisages suggests a process of infinite deferral reminiscent of the *mise-en-abyme* effect so frequently encountered in *A Dead Man in Deptford*. The chain of etymologies, the repetition of citations, the exchange of roles, and the reduplication of theatrical performances all the pursuit of something that invariably manages to remain out of reach: the primary meaning of a personal name, the ultimate source of an utterance, the true identity of the performer, and the true nature of the situation represented in the performances. What is more, these failed attempts to reach these elusive objects of pursuit presuppose an empty space needed to be filled in, an image Nicholl uses when he refers to the intention of making up for the missing pieces of the jigsaw "with new facts, with new ways of seeing old facts, with probabilities and speculations." Like the motif of infinite regression, that of the vacuum to be filled in is one that figures in the novel as well, evoked by the binary opposition between *something* and *nothing* which

occurs throughout the narrative. Relating what might have happened to Marlowe consists precisely in sealing the gaps of the Narrator's knowledge with educated guesses.

In addition to the fictional construction of Christopher Marlowe, Benjamin's building metaphor is applicable to naming. Indeed, the enquiry into the naming practices employed in *A Dead Man in Deptford* has as its starting point the onomastic reflections encouraged by a name given to a building. Viewed together, the excerpts "in that [rose] garden I am ready to build what I shall call the Rose" [p.17], "Alleyn was with Henslowe (...) sniffing roses and stringing measuring lines on earth cruelly stripped of its bushes" [p.35], and "the Rose that had supplanted the roses long planted on the site (...) smelt of no roses" [p.117] plot not only the construction of Philip Henslowe's playhouse but also the process whereby a name loses the significance it originally held for the name-giver. As well as identifying the building it is bestowed on, *the Rose* gives testimony to the semantic intent behind Henslowe's act of performative naming, a semantic intent subsequent users of the name are ignorant of. In Marlowe's case the user's ignorance concerns the self *Christopher Marlowe* names. Is it the Marlowe the Narrator constructs, the combative yet conflicted and vulnerable Marlowe alienated from his contemporaries on account of his quest for personal authenticity? Or is it the Marlowe that emerges from the findings of the inquest into the Deptford affray, the vicious and depraved Marlowe who receives his just desserts in a tavern brawl? As Marlowe says of the existence of God, "[s]imply and in all candour we must shrug and say we know nothing" [p.161].

In the final analysis, then, what is left with is Burgess's cryptic statement made in the curtain speech at the end of the book: "[o]nly the continuity of a name rides above a grumbling compromise" [p.269]. Applied to Marlowe, or rather the person referred to today as *Christopher Marlowe*, this might be taken to mean that the name identifies so many constructs of its long-dead bearer, among them Burgess's alienated homosexual intellectual, as to cease to have any real meaning.

Bibliography

Literary Sources

Best, Michael. "Internet Shakespeare Editions," University of Victoria, consulted on 2005. <http://ise.uvic.ca/Foyer/quality.html>

Bondanella, Peter & Mark Musa (trads.). 1984. *Niccolò Machiavelli. The Prince*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Burgess, Anthony. 1982 (1964). *Nothing like the Sun*. Reading: Vintage.

——. 1987. *Little Wilson and Big God*. Reading: Vintage.

——. "A Meeting in Valladolid," in Anthony Burgess *The Devil's Mode* (Reading: Vintage, 1990 [1989]), 11-29.

——. "The Most Beautified," in Anthony Burgess *The Devil's Mode* (Reading: Vintage, 1990 [1989]), 30-39.

——. 1990. *You've Had your Time*. Reading: Vintage.

Cowen, Janet (ed.). 1969. *Sir Thomas Malory: Le Morte d'Arthur*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Craig, William James and Edward Dowden. (eds.) 1912. *The Works of Shakespeare* (3 vols.). London, New York, Toronto and Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Crisp, Roger (trad.). 2000. *Aristotle. Nicomachean Ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davies, John Llewelyn and David James Vaughan (trads.). 1997 (1886). *Plato: Republic*. Ware: Wordsworth.

Dorsten, Jan van (ed.). 1966. *Sidney. A Defence of Poetry*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Gill, Christopher (trad.). 1999. *Plato. The Symposium*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Hamilton, Walter (trad.). 1973. *Plato. Phaedrus and Letters VII and VIII*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Heath, Malcolm (trad.). 1996. *Aristotle. Poetics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Jonson, Ben. "Discoveries Made upon Men and Matter and some Poems," consulted on 8 May 2008 <http://www.home.hiwaay.net/~paul/jonson/discshake.htm>

Mares, Francis Hugh. (ed.). 1988. *William Shakespeare: Much Ado About Nothing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Montaigne's Essays: Book II, consulted on 1 October 2008, Renaissance Editions, <www.uoregon.edu/-rbear/montaigne/2xii.htm>

Mulryne, J.R. (ed.). 1989. *Thomas Kyd. The Spanish Tragedy*. London: A & C Black.

Reeve, C.D.C. (trad.). 1998. *Plato: Cratylus*. Indianapolis: Hackett.

Steane, John Barry. (ed.). 1969. *Christopher Marlowe. The Complete Plays*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

The Holy Bible, Authorized King James Version. 1957 (1611). London and New York: Collins.

The Internet Classics Archive. "The Eclogues by Virgil," consulted on 21 January 2009 <http://classics.mit.edu/Virgil/eclogue.2.ii.html>

Thorpe, Lewis (ed.) 1966. *Geoffrey of Monmouth: The History of the Kings of Britain*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Tucker Brooke, C.F. (ed.). 1910. *The Works of Christopher Marlowe*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Secondary Sources

Alexander, Gillian. "Politics of the Pronoun in the Literature of the English Revolution," in Ronald Carter (ed.) *Language and Literature: An Introductory Reader in Stylistics* (London and New York: Routledge), 216-35.

Algeo, J. 1973. *On Defining the Proper Name*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press.

Allan, Keith. "Something that Rhymes with Rich," in Adrienne Lehrer and Eva Feder Kittay (eds.) *Frames, Fields and Contrasts* (Hillsdale, New Jesery and London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1992), 355-74.

Allan, Keith and Kate Burridge. 1991. *Euphemism and Dysphemism: Language Used as Shield and Weapon*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Allerton, Derek. "The linguistic and sociolinguistic status of proper names." *Journal of Pragmatics* 11, 1987: 61-92.

Anderson, John. "On the structure of names." *Folia Linguistica* 37, 2003: 347-98.

——. "On the Grammatical Status of Names." *Language* 80 (3), 2004: 435-74.

Andrés Suárez, Irene. "*La autorreferencialidad en el teatro español del Siglo de Oro*," in Irene Andrés Suárez et al. *El teatro dentro del teatro: Cervantes, Lope, Tirso y Calderón* (Fuenlabrada: Editorial Verbum, 1997), 11-29.

Askanas, Malgosia. and Eva Feder Kittay. "What's in a Name?" *Philosophia* 8, 1979: 689-99.

Austin, John Langshaw 1975 (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Bakeless, John. 1942. *The Tragicall History of Christopher Marlowe*. (2 vols.) Cambridge, Massachussetts: Havard University Press.

Barber, Charles. 1996 (1976). *Early Modern English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Barbour, Richmond. "'When I Acted Young Antinous:' Boy Actors and the Erotics of Jonsonian Theater."*PMLA* 110, 1995: 1006-23.

Barney, Rachel. 2001. *Names and Nature in Plato's* Cratylus. New York and London: Routledge.

Benjamin, Walter. 1970. *Illuminations*. London: Pimlico.

Boas, Frederick Samuel. 1940. *Christopher Marlowe. A Biographical and Crictical Study*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Bolt, Rodney. 2004. *History Play: The Lives and Afterlives of Christopher Marlowe*. London: Harper Collins.

Bjørge, Anne Kari. "The explicitation of proper names in expository news texts." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 13 (1), 2003: 115-38.

Bray, Alan.1982. *Homosexuality in Renaissance England*. Nørhaven: Gay Men's Press.

——. "Homosexuality and the signs of Male Friendship in Elizabethan England." *History Workshop Journal* 29, 1990: 1-19.

Bredbeck, Gregory W. 1991. *Sodomy and Interpretation: Marlowe to Milton*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Brooke-Rose, Christine. 1958. *A Grammar of Metaphor*. London: Secker and Warburg.

Brown, Roger and Maguerite Ford. "Address in American English." *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*. 62, 1961: 375-385.

Brown, Roger and Albert Gilman. "The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity," in Thomas A. Sebeok (ed.) *Style in Language* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: the M.I.T. Press, 1960), 253-76.

——. "Politeness Theory and Shakespeare's Four Major Tragedies". *Language in Society* 18, 1989: 159-212.

Brown, Penelope & Stephen C. Levinson. 1987 (1978). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burgess, Anthony. 1966. "Introduction to Daniel Defoe *A Journal of the Plague Year*." Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1966 (1722): 6-20.

——. 1970. *Shakespeare*. Reading: Vintage.

——. 1975 (1964). *Language Made Plain*. Bungay: Fontana/Collins.

——. 1992. *A Mouthful of Air: Language, Languages ... Especially English*. New York: William Morrow & Company.

Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York and London: Routledge.

——. 1997. *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative*. New York and London: Routledge.

Byatt, A.S. "Introduction," in Anthony Burgess *ABBA ABBA* (London: Vinatage, 2000), 1-6.

Calvo, Clara. 1991 (1990). *Fool-Master Discourse in Shakespeare: A Discourse Stylistics Approach to Dramatic Dialogue*. Nottingham: Monographs in Systemic Linguistics.

Carroll, John M. 1985. *What's in a Name? An Essay in the Psychology of Reference*. New York: W.H. Freeman and Company.

Chedgzoy, Kate. "Marlowe's men and women: gender and sexuality," in Patrick Cheney (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Christopher Marlowe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 245-61.

Clark, Cecily. "Onomastics," in Norman Blake (ed.) *The Cambridge History of the English Language Vol. II 1066 – 1476*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 542-606.

Comrie, Bernard. 1976. "Linguistic Politeness Axes: Speaker-Addressee, Speaker-Referent, Speaker-Bystander" *Pragmatics Microfiche*, 1.7., A3-B1.

Cook, Jonathan. "Discourse," in Roger Fowler (ed.) *A Dictionary of Modern Critical Terms* (London and New York: Routledge, 1987 [1973]), 62-6.

Cruse, D. Alan. "Antonymy Revisted: Some Thoughts on the Relationship between Words and Concepts," in Adrienne Lehrer and Eva Feder Kittay (eds.) *Frames, Fields and Contrasts* (Hillsdale, New Jesery and London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1992), 289-305.

Culpeper, Jonathan. "Towards an anatomy of impoliteness." *Journal of Pragmatics*. 25, 350-67: 1995 (1994).

Cunningham, Karen. "Renaissance Execution and Marlovian Elocution: The Drama of Death." *PMLA* 105, 1990: 209-22.

Doležel, Lubomír. "Narrative Semantics. *PTL: A Journal for Descriptive Poetics and Theory of Literature*. 1, 1976: 129-151.

Dollimore, Jonathan. 1991. *Sexual Dissidence: Augustine to Wilde, Freud to Foucault*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Downie, James Alan. “Marlowe: facts and fictions,” in James Alan Downie and J.T. Parnell (eds.) *Constructing Christopher Marlowe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000) 13-29.

Downing, Bruce T. “Vocatives and third-person imperatives in English.” *Papers in Linguistics*. 1.3, 1969: 570-92.

Eccles, Mark. 1934. *Marlowe in London*. Cambridge, Massachussetts: Havard University Press.

Elam, Keir. 1984. *Shakespeare’s Universe of Discourse: Language-Games in the Comedies*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Erikson, Kai T. “Notes on the sociology of deviance.” *Social Problems* 9, 1962: 307-314.

Ervin-Tripp, Susan. “On Sociolinguistic Rules: Alternation and Co-occurrence,” in Gumperz, John J. and Dell Hymes (eds.) *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication* (Oxford and New York: Basil Blackwell, 1986 [1972]), 213-50.

Fairclough, Norman. 1989. *Language and Power*. Harlow: Longman.

——. 1995. *Media Discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.

Farey, Peter “The Spelling of Marlowe’s Name,” consulted on 25 April 2006. <http://www2.pestel.co.uk/rey/names.htm>

Fasold, Ralph. “Address Forms,” in Ralph Fasold *The Sociolinguistics of Language* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990), 1-38.

Fill, Alwin F. “‘Divided illocutions’ in conversational and other situations ―and some of its implications.” *IRAL* 24 (1),1986: 27-34.

Fillmore, Charles. “Frames and the Semantics of Understanding.” *Quaderni di Semantica* IV, 1985: 222-54.

Fillmore, Charles J. and Beryl T. Atkins. “Toward a Frame-Based Lexicon: The Semantics of RISK and its Neighbors,” in Adrienne Lehrer and Eva Feder Kittay (eds.) *Frames, Fields, and Contrasts: New Essays in Semantic and Lexical Organization* (Hillsdale, New Jesery and London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1992), 75-101.

Fowler, Roger. 1986. *Linguistic Criticism*. Oxford and New York. Oxford University Press.

Fraser, Bruce & William Nolen. “The association of deference with linguistic form.” *International Journal of Linguistics* 27, 1981: 93-109.

Frege, Gottlieb. “On sense and nominatum,” in Hebert Feigl and Wilfrid Sellars (eds.) *Readings in Philosophical Analysis* (New York: Appleton Century Crofts, 1949) 85-102.

Galbraith, Mary. “Deictic Shift Theory and the Poetics of Involvement in Narrative,” in Duchan, Judith F., Gail A. Bruder and Lynne E. Hewitt (eds.) *Deixis in Narrative: A Cognitive Science Perspective* (Hillsdale, New Jesery and Hove: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1995), 19-59.

Gardiner, Alan. 1954. *A Theory of Proper Names: A Controversial Essay*. London, New York and Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Goffman, Erving. “The Nature of Deference and Demeanor.” *American Anthropologist* 58, 1956: 473-502.

——. 1971 (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Harmondsworth: Pelican.

——. 1963. *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

——. 1974. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Boston, Massachussetts: Northeastern University Press.

Gove, Walter R. “The Labelling Perspective: An Overview,” in Walter R. Gove (ed.) *The Labelling of Deviance: Evaluating a Perspective* (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1980 [1975]), 9-26.

Graves, Robert. 1960 (1955). *The Greek Myths* vol. 1. Harmondsworth: Pelican.

Greenblatt, Stephen. 2005 (1980). *Renaissance Self-Fashioning from More to Shakespeare*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Greg, Walter Wilson. “The Damnation of Faustus.” *Modern Language Review* 41, 1946: 97-107.

Griffiths, Gareth. “Persona,” in Roger Fowler (ed.) *A Dictionary of Modern Critical Terms* (London and New York: Routledge, 1987 [1973]), 176-177.

Grice, Herbert Paul. “Logic and Conversation,” in P. Cole and J. Morgan (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts* (New York: Academic Press, 1975), 41-59.

Grodzinski, Eugeniusz. “Proper Names, Common Names and Singular Descriptions.” *Onoma* 24, 1980: 10-15.

Hartman, A. Arthur et al. “Unique Personal Names as a Social Adjustment Factor.” *The Journal of Social Psychology* 75, 1968: 107-110.

Haynes, Alan. 2004. *Walsingham: Elizabethan Spymaster and Statesman*. Stroud: Sutton Publishing.

Henderson, P. 1972. *Christopher Marlowe*. London: Longman.

Holtgraves, Thomas. "Social Psychology, Cognitive Psychology and Linguistic Politeness." *Journal of Politeness Reseach*. 1, 2005: 73-93.

Hopkins, Lisa. 2000. *Christopher Marlowe: A Literary Life*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

——. "Marlowe's reception and influence," in Patrick Cheney (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Christopher Marlowe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 282-95.

Hotson, Leslie J. 1925. *The Death of Christopher Marlowe*. London & Cambridge Mass.: The Nonesuch & Havard University Press.

Hunter, Michael. "The Problem of 'Atheism' in Early Modern England." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 35, 1985: 135-157.

Hunter, George Kirkpatrick. "The Theology of Marlowe's *The Jew of Malta*." *JWCI* 28, 1964: 211-240.

Jespersen, Otto. 1924. *The Philosophy of Grammar*. London: George Allen and Unwin.

Joos, Martin. 1967. *The Five Clocks*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Kövecses, Zoltan. 1988. *The Language of Love*. Lewisburg: Associated University Press.

——. 1990. *Emotion Concepts*. New York.

Kramarae et al. 1984. *Language and Power*. Beverley Hills: Sage.

Kripke, Saul A. "Naming and Necessity," in Donald Davidson and Gilbert Harman (eds.) *Semantics of Natural Language* (Dordrecht and Boston: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1972), 253-355.

Lakoff, George. 1987. *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Lawson, E.D. "Men's First Names, Nicknames, and Short Names: A Semantic Differential Analysis." *Names* 21, 1973: 22-27.

Leal, Amy. "Affirmative Naming in *No Name*." *Names* 52 1, 2004: 3-19.

Leech, Geoffrey N. 1969. *A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry*. London and New York: Longman.

——. 1981 (1974). *Semantics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

——. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London and New York: Longman.

——. "Foregrounding," in Roger Fowler (ed.) *A Dictionary of Modern Critical Terms* (London and New York: Routledge, 1987 [1973]), 97-98.

Leech, Geoffrey N. & Michael H. Short. 1981. *Style in Fiction*. London and New York: Longman.

Lehrer, Adrienne. "Names and Naming: Why we Need Fields and Frames," in Adrienne Lehrer, Adrienne and Eva Feder Kittay (eds.) *Frames, Fields, and Contrasts: New Essays in Semantic and Lexical Organization* (Hillsdale, New Jesery & London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1992), 123-142.

Leisi, Ernst. "On the Trail of Old Nick," in Andreas Fischer (ed.) *The History and the Dialects of English* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1989), 53-57.

Leith, Dick. "Tudor London: sociolinguistic stratification and linguistic change." *Midland Association of Linguistic Studies Journal*, 9, 1984: 47-64.

Levin, Harry. 1961. *Marlowe the Overreacher*. London: Faber and Faber.

Levine, Laura. "Men in Women's Clothing: Anti-theatricality and Effeminization from 1579 to 1642." *Criticism* Vol. XXXVIII No. 2, 1986: 121-143.

Levinson, Stephen C. 1979. "Pragmatics and social deixis." *Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society*, 226-223.

——. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lieberson, Stanley. "What's in a name? Some sociolinguistic possibilities." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. 45, 1984: 177-187.

Lodge, David. 1992. *The Art of Fiction*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

——. "The Making of 'Anthony Burgess'," in David Lodge *The Practice of Writing*. (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1996), 141-9.

Long, Ralph Bernard. "The Grammar of English Proper Names." *Names* 17, 1969: 107-126.

Loomis, C. Grant. "About American Pseudonymity." *Names* 3, 1955: 236-238.

Lyons, John. 1977a. *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

——. 1977b. "Deixis and Anaphora," in T. Myers (ed.) *The Development of Conversation and Discourse* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1977), 88-103.

Marcus, Leah. "Textual Instability and Ideological Difference: The Case of *Doctor Faustus*," in Leah Marcus *Unediting the Renaissance* (New York & London: Routledge, 1996) 38-67.

Markey, Thomas L. "Crisis and Cognition in Onomastics." *Names* 30, 1982: 129-142.

McWhir, Anne. "Elizabeth Thomas and the Two Corinnas: Giving the Woman Writer a Bad Name." *ELH* (62) 1, 1995: 105-119.

Mellen Wehling, Mary. “Marlowe’s Mnemonic Nominology with Especial Reference to *Tamburlaine*.” *Modern Language Notes*. 73, 4, 1958: 243-247.

Mercer, Peter. “Tragedy,” in Roger Fowler (ed.) *A Dictionary of Modern Critical Terms* (London and New York: Routledge, 1987 [1973]), 250-53.

Mill, John Stuart. 1956 (1843). *A System of Logic*. Oxford and New York: Longman

Morgan, Jane et al. 1979. *Nicknames: Their Origins and Social Consequences*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Munson Deats, Sara. 1997. *Sex, Gender, and Desire in the Plays of Christopher Marlowe*. Newark: University of Delaware Press.

Nelson, Robert J. 1958. *Play within a Play. The Dramatist’s Conception of his Art: Shakespeare to Anouilh*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Nevalainen, Tertu and Helena Raumolin-Brunberg. “Constraints on Politeness. The Pragmatics of Address Formulae in Early English Correspondence,” in Andreas H. Jucker (ed.) *Historical Pragmatics: Pragmatic Developments in the History of English* (Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins B.V., 1995), 515-601.

Nicholl, Charles. 1992. *The Reckoning. The Murder of Christopher Marlowe*. London: Picador.

Normand, Lawrence. “Edward II, Derek Jarman, England,” in James Alan Downie and J.T. Parnell (eds.) *Constructing Christopher Marlowe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000) 177-93.

Nuessel, Frank. 1992. *The Study of Names: A Guide to Principles and Topics*. Westport: Greenwood Press.

Orgel, Stephen. “Nobody’s Perfect: Or Why Did the English Stage Take Boys for Women?” *South Atlantic Quarterly* 88: 1, 1989: 7-29.

Padučeva, E.V. “Anaphoric Relations and their Representation in the Deep Structure of a Text,” in M. Bierwisch and K. E. Heidolph (eds.) *Progress in Linguistics: A Collection of Papers* (The Hague: Mouton, 1970): 224-232.

Parker, Geoffrey. 1979. *Europe in Crisis: 1598 - 1648*. Glasgow: Fontana.

Pennock, Barry. 2000. *A Genre Approach to Re-entry Patterns in Editorials*. Valencia: Studies in English Language and Linguistics.

Pulgram, Ernst. 1954. *Theory of Names*. Berkeley, California: American Name Society.

Pulman, Stephen G. “Metaphor,” in Roger Fowler (ed.) *A Dictionary of Modern Critical Terms* (London and New York: Routledge, 1987 [1973]), 144-145.

Quirk, Randolph. “Shakespeare and the English Language,” in Kenneth Muir and S. Shoenbaum (eds.) *A New Companion to Shakespeare Studies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), 67-82.

Replogle, Carol. “Shakespeare’s Salutations: A Study in Social Etiquette.” *Studies in Philology* 1987, 70: 172-186.

Riggs, David. “Marlowe’s life,” in Patrick Cheney (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Christopher Marlowe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 24-40.

Roberts, Gareth. “Marlowe and the metaphysics of magic,” in James Alan Downie and J.T. Parnell (eds.) *Constructing Christopher Marlowe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000) 55-73.

Ross, James. “Semantic Contagion,” in Adrienne Lehrer and Eva Feder Kittay (eds.) *Frames, Fields, and Contrasts: New Essays in Semantic and Lexical Organization* (Hillsdale, New Jesery & London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1992), 143-168.

Russell, Bertrand. “On denoting.” *Mind* 67, 1905: 479-493.

Ryle, Gilbert. “The Theory of Meaning,” in Charles E. Caton (ed.) *Philosophy and Ordinary Language* (Urbana, Chicago & London: University of Illinois Press, 1963), 128-153.

Salgãdo, Gãmino. “Christopher Marlowe,” in Christopher Ricks (ed.) *English Drama to 1710* (London: Barrie and Jenkins, 1971), 118-147.

Saussure, Ferdinand de. 1971 (1915). *Cours de linguistique générale*. Paris: Payot.

Savage, B.M. and F.L. Wells. “A Note on Singularity on Given Names.” *The Journal of Social Psychology* 27, 1948: 271-272.

Sage, Lorna and Victor Sage. “Theme,” in Roger Fowler (ed.) *A Dictionary of Modern Critical Terms* (London and New York: Routledge, 1987 [1973]), 248-249.

Schalkwyk, David. “What’s in a name?’: Derrida, apartheid, and the logic of the proper name.” *Language Sciences* 22, 2000: 167-191.

Scollon, Ron. & Suzanne Wong Scollon. 1995. *Intercultural Communication: A Discourse Approach*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Searle, John Rogers. “Proper Names”. *Mind* 67, 1958: 166-173.

——. “The problem of proper names,” in John R. Searle *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), 162-174.

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. 1985. *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosexual Desire*. New York: Columbia University Press.

——. 1990. *Epistemology of the Closet*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Seeman, M.V. “Name and Identity.” *Canadian Journal of Psychology* 25, 1980: 129-137.

——. “The Unconscious Meaning of Personal Names.” *Names*, 31, 4, 1983: 237-242.

Sell, Roger D. “The Politeness of Literary Texts,” in Roger D. Sell (ed.) *Literary Pragmatics* (London & New York: Routledge, 1991), 208-224.

Smith, Bruce R. 1991. *Homosexual Desire in Shakespeare’s England: A Cultural Poetics*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Sørensen, Holger Steen. 1958. *Word-Classes in Modern English, with Special Reference to Proper Names with an Introductory Theory of Grammar, Meaning and Reference*. Copenhagen: Gad Publisher.

Steane, John Barry. 1965. *Marlowe: A Critical Study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stidd, Sean C. “Proper names, predicative uses: an essay on logical form.” *Language Sciences* 26, 2004: 173-215.

Stone, Lawrence. “Social Mobility in England, 1500-1700.” *Past and Present* 33, 1966: 16-55.

Strawson, Peter Frederick. “On Referring,” in Charles E. Caton (ed.) *Philosophy and Ordinary Language* (Urbana, Chicago & London: University of Illinois Press, 1963), 162-193.

Summers, Montague. 1994 (1925). *The History of Witchcraft*. London: Senate.

Tillyard, Eustace Mandeville Wetenhall. 1943. *The Elizabethan World Picture*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Ullman, Stephen. 1957. *The Principles of Semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

——. 1962. *Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning*. Oxford: Blackwell.

——. “Stylistics and Semantics,” in Seymour Chapman (ed.) *Literary Style: A Symposium* (London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1971), 133-152.

Ungerer, F. and H. J. Schmid. 1996. *An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics*. London & New York: Longman.

Wales, Kathleen. “‘Thou’ and ‘you’ in Early Modern English: Brown and Gilman re-appraised.” *Studia Linguistica*, 37 (2), 1983: 107-123.

Ward, Gregory. “Equatives and Deferred Reference.” Language 80 2, 2004: 262- .

——. “A Pragmatic Analysis of Epitomization: Topicalization It’s not.” *Papers in Linguistics* 17, 1984: 145-61.

Watt, Ian P. “The Naming of Characters in Defoe, Richardson, and Fielding.” *Review of English Studies*, xxv 1949: 322-38.

Weil, Judith. 1977. *Christopher Marlowe: Merlin’s Prophet*. London and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Whitfield White, Paul. “Marlowe and the politics of religion,” in Patrick Cheney (ed.) *The Cambridge companion to Christopher Marlowe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 70-87.

Wildeblood, Joan and Peter Brinson. 1965. *The Polite World*. London and New York: Oxford University Press.

Williamson, Hugh Ross. 1972. *Kind Kit. An Informal Biography of Christopher Marlowe*. London: Michael Joseph Ltd.

Wrong, Dennis H. 1979. *Power: Its Forms, Bases and Uses*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Young Greg, Joan. 1997. *Devils, Women, and Jews*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.

Yuhan, A. H. and Stuart C. Shapiro. “Computational Representations of Space,” in J.F. Duchan et al. (eds.) *Deixis in Narrative* (Hillsdale and Hove: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1996), 191-225.

Wilkins, David P. “Interjections as Deictics,” in Judith F. Duchan, Gail A. Bruder and Lynne E. Hewitt (eds.) *Deixis in Narrative* (Hillsdale, New Jersey and Hove: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1995), 359-386.

Zabeeh, Farhang. 1969. *What Is In A Name? An Inquiry Into The Semantics And Pragmatics Of Proper Names*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Zubin, David A. and Lynne E. Hewitt. “The Deictic Center: A Theory of Deixis in Narrative,” in Duchan, Judith F., Gail A. Bruder and Lynne E. Hewitt (eds.) *Deixis in Narrative: A Cognitive Science Perspective* (Hillsdale, New Jesery and Hove: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1995), 129-155.

Zwicky, Arnold M. 1974. “Hey, Whatsyourname!” *Proceedings from the Tenth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society,* 787-801.

Reference Works

Abercrombie, Nicholas *et al*. 2000 (1984). *Dictionary of Sociology*. London: Penguin.

Ayers, Michael Richard. “Substance,” in Edward Craig (ed.) *The Routledge Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*.

Baldick, Chris. 1990. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bussmann, Hadumod. 1996. *Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics*.London and New York: Routledge.

Chalker, Sue. 1984. *Current English Grammar*. London: MacMillan.

Cowie, Anthony Paul. et al. (eds.). 1993 (1983). *Oxford Dictionary of English Idioms, vol. 2*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Crystal, David. 1988. *The English Language*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

——. 1991 (1980). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

——. 1995. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cuddon, John Anthony. 1979. *A Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Grimal, Pierre. 1991 (1951). *The Penguin Dictionary of Classical Mythology*. London: Penguin.

Huddlestone, Rodney. 1988. *English Grammar: An Outline*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kershaw, Stephen (ed.). 1990 (1951). *The Penguin Dictionary of Classical Mythology*. London: Penguin.

Partridge, Eric. 1950 (1949). *Name into Word: Proper Names That Have Become Common Property*. New York: Books For Libraries Press.

——. 1968 (1947). *Shakespeare's Bawdy. A Literary and Psychological Essay and a Comprehensive Glossary*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Perasall, Judy (ed.). 1998. *The New Oxford Dictionary of English*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Pickering, David. 1999. *Dictionary of First Names*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Quirk, Randolph et al. 1985. *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. London: Longman.

Reaney, Percy Hide and Richard Middlewood Wilson. (ed.). 1997 (1958). *A Dictionary of English Surnames*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Room, Adrian. 1989. *A Dictionary of Pseudonyms and their Origins, with Stories of Name Changes*. Chicago and London: St James Press.

Simpson, John Andrew and Edmund S.C. Weiner (eds.) 1989. *The Oxford English Dictionary. Second Edition*. Oxford: Clarendon Press (20 vols.)

The Catholic Encyclopedia. “Saint Nicholas,” consulted on 24 February 2005 <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen703728a.htm>

——. “Atheism,” consulted on 24 February 2005 <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/02040a.htm>

Wales, Katie. 1989. *A Dictionary of Stylistics*. London and New York: Longman.

Weekley, Ernest. 1967 (1921). *An Etymological Dictionary of Modern English in Two Volumes*. New York: Dover Publications.

Williams, Gordon. 1994. *A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery in Shakespearean and Stuart Literature* (3 vols.). Bungay: The Athlone Press.